

941.58  
On22i

IRELAND'S CASE,  
DISEASE AND REMEDY,

RESPECTFULLY STATED

TO THE PEOPLE, THE LEGISLATURE,  
AND  
THE ARISTOCRACY  
OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

THE LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

BY JOHN A. O'NEILL, ESQ.,  
OF BUNOWEN CASTLE,  
Ex-J. P.,

FORMERLY, MEMBER FOR KINGSTON-ON-HULL.

"Le contrat du Gouvernement est tellement dissous par le despotisme, que le despote n'est maître qu' aussi longtemps qu' il est le plus fort et sitôt qu' on pent l' expulser il n' a point à réclamer contre la violence."

ROUSSEAU.

Errat longè meā quidem sententia  
Qui imperium credit gravius esse aut stabilius  
Vi quod fit, quam illud quod amicitia adjungitur.

TERENCE.

DUBLIN:  
PUBLISHED BY JAMES DUFFY, 25, ANGLESEA-ST.  
LONDON: W. STRANGE, PATERNOSTER-ROW.  
1844.

Price—One Shilling and Six-pence.



To the Earl of Arundel with the  
Author's bestandful regards

## IRELAND'S CASE,

# DISEASE AND REMEDY,

RESPECTFULLY STATED

TO THE PEOPLE, THE LEGISLATURE,

AND

THE ARISTOCRACY

OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

BY JOHN A. O'NEILL, ESQ.,

OF BUNOWEN CASTLE,

Ex-J. P.,

FORMERLY, MEMBER FOR KINGSTON-ON-HULL.

"Le contrat du Gouvernement est tellement dissous par le despotisme, que le despote n'est maître qu' aussi longtemps qu' il est le plus fort et sitôt qu' on pent l' expulser il n' a point à réclamer contre la violence."

ROUSSEAU.

Errat longè mēa quidem sententia  
Qui imperium credit gravius esse aut stabilius  
Vi quod sit, quām illud quod amicitia adjungitur.

TERENCE.

DUBLIN:

PUBLISHED BY JAMES DUFFY, 25, ANGLESEA-ST.

LONDON: W. STRANGE, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

1844.

*Price—One Shilling and Six-pence.*

## TRANSLATION OF MOTTOES.

---

"The contract of Government is so far dissolved by despotism, that the despot is master only while he is the stronger: the moment he can be expelled he has no right to complain of the violence of that step."

ROUSSEAU.

"In my opinion, it is an error to suppose a government supported by force to be more powerful and more durable than one sustained by friendship."

TERENCE.

941.58  
On 22/1

## DEDICATORY PREFACE.

THE following pages are respectfully inscribed to the three Estates of the Empire—the PEOPLE, the LEGISLATURE, and the ARISTOCRACY.

To the People, because it is a received opinion that a temperate statement of their wrongs, however deficient in talent the writers may be, contributes to awaken general sympathy, and to cement between fellow-subjects a friendly feeling, based on the Christian precept—brotherly love, as well as on the worldly maxim—community of interest.

It is necessary to allude to the Ministry and to the representative body, because the common weal is in so great a degree dependant on their measures.

Talent, birth, station, wealth and title are the headings of the classes which constitute the Aristocracy. Without including worth, the term aristocracy is a misnomer; but worth, though not as a matter of course a component part of what is called (worldly) greatness, is an occasional adjunct to it; the Peerage and untitled Aristocracy of the Empire, to the honour of both, afford some noble specimens of a union between virtue and rank.

Every *soundly-based* and *fair* privilege of an order (the Aristocracy commencing with the Sovereign) which includes many eminent and truly worthy persons, should be scrupulously respected. Happily this can often be done without infringing popular rights; but all just-minded men will admit, that wherever they clash, the former should give way; for the welfare and happiness of the MULTITUDE depend on the possession of those rights—and of them there should be no compromise whatsoever.

As it has been repeatedly asserted in print that “ no loyal man would join the Repeal Association”—the writer, without professing any more loyalty than ninety-nine out of every hundred Repealers possesses, thinks it right to state, that before any person in the empire suggested or spoke of any measure for the better protection of the Sovereign (after the fourth alarm), he published in the Dublin papers the outline of a bill, headed “ for the better protection of the Queen,” and containing clauses to meet every possible case of aggression on her Majesty. He coupled with this publication a letter to Sir R. Peel. He handed a printed copy to the private secretary of the Lord Lieutenant, Earl De Grey, and forwarded copies to Sir R. Peel, Colonel Anson, Sir H. Wheatley, and Sir James Graham. Every official personage but Sir J. Graham courteously acknowledged the receipt of these documents ; and Colonel Anson did the writer the honour to say, he was instructed by Prince Albert to express his Royal Highness’s thanks.

Some days afterwards Sir R. Peel gave notice in the House that he would shortly bring in a bill “ for the better protection of the Queen.” He did so, and used the very term the writer gave the bill, and included in it several of the clauses the writer drew—preserving even his words. It is not, however, to be admitted that any man who was not a Minister of State could, by possibility, see that which had escaped the notice of cabinet eyes.

“ Sic vos non vobis.”

## CHAPTER I.

### THE PROPHECY—THE DIFFICULTIES—THEIR CAUSE—THE REMEDY— THE CRISIS—PERIL OF POSTPONEMENT.

SIR ROBERT PEEL said that Ireland would be the difficulty of his government—it required no preternatural endowment to foresee this, for he worked out his own prophecy. He knew the consequences of misrule, and calculated on the course which a majority of his colleagues would oblige him to pursue; he was aware of the long list of sins, of omission and commission, all his predecessors could be charged with; and whether he felt a deficiency of moral courage, or calculated on a want of political influence, he arrived at the conclusion, that he should not be able either to atone for the past, or amend as to the future: he had not sufficient of the Hercules in his composition to turn a pure stream into the Augean State Stable. Sir Robert's difficulties cannot be traced to the Irish people, but to misgovernment of them. As well might the West Indian planter, of old, charge his slaves with generating the yellow fever, after he made them toil under a scorching sun.

When Sir Robert took office, he found Ireland calm but not happy; solvent—not prosperous; despondent—not *hopeless*. Only a few years elapsed, and calm gave place to excitement; solvent verged towards bankruptcy; and *slender hope is succeeded by utter despair*. The Right Honourable Baronet's administration is far from being answerable for all the grievances of Ireland, he has only increased the list. If the present crisis be perilous to the empire, his government is responsible for that; for matters could not have arrived at a *crisis* had pains been taken to avert it by *prompt* measures, at once bold, just, conciliatory, popular, and absolutely *expedient*. Yes, expedient—for the days of exclusive oligarchic power are numbered in both nations; the People must soon, very soon, obtain their legitimate weight—in neither do they now possess it.

If any man used seditious language, why did the law slumber or the Executive connive? The first offender was responsible for his own offence, but the Government which allowed it to pass unnoticed became responsible to public justice and to society for the crime of the second offender. Was Mr. A's culpability greater because Mr. B used the same expression, or Mr. C reported it in his paper? Why was not the first offender put on his trial before a jury of his countrymen for his *first* offence? Thus would the spirit of the Constitution and of the law have been borne out; for the offence would have been met in that

stage where, whilst punishment might have been nominal, the warning would have been effectual.

Was the first monster meeting an abuse of constitutional liberty? an assumption of a non-existing right? or an aggression on the public peace? If it were any of these why was it not instantly noticed by a suitable and monitory proclamation to prevent a recurrence of the misdemeanor? A hundred naughts cannot make a unit, and a monthly repetition could not convert into illegality what was not illegal.

This Government has a right to ATONE to the people and GENTRY of Ireland, for suffering them to be drawn into an agitation which it considered, and determined to brand and punish as petty treason. The Government cannot do too much to evince its contrition and to conciliate and serve the People, thus—if their own statements be true—doubly betrayed; betrayed, says the Government, by their leaders, who taught them to seek an impossibility, or, if possible, a ruinous measure, through the perils of indictment, in the path of rebellion; betrayed, say the enlightened of both the Old and New World, by the Government which would neither interpose good practical measures to wean the people from seeking visionary ones, nor use the authority with which it was invested to check a career now characterized by it as leading to revolution.

It is to be lamented that the Prime Minister did not allow his prophetic inspiration somewhat a wider scope: it would have told him that the time approaches when there will be no choice—that he could only postpone the hour of payment to the people at great risk; with the probability that the demand would *increase*, and the *certainty that it could not diminish*. Had he, instead of trusting to an *ignis fatuus*, consulted the oracles of justice and prudence, they would have taught him something more than that he would be “in difficulties.” They would have shown him how to extricate himself; they would have inculcated the necessity of placing the Representation of Great Britain and Ireland on such a footing, *that the people would feel themselves represented; and instead of being obliged to form into Unions, Leagues, Associations, Societies, and Conventions, [they] would have confidence in the great representative body, and would look on the Imperial Parliament as the sole court of appeal, tribunal for redress, and fountain of justice.*

All the laurels of the Reform Bill were ungathered, and would have wreathed the brow of the Minister, who, though at first opposed to it, yet finding it the law of the land, had the magnanimity to give that vitality to the principle which the framers of the act omitted to bestow—*extension of the Franchise* (perhaps even ballot) *must eventually take place*; but if England now complains of limits in her franchise, is not Ireland’s case an outrage on all decency? and if this administration did not choose

to purify on a great scale, surely they cannot pretend to think that there was no room for improvement, and that nothing should have been done for long-misgoverned Ireland.

Another matter, of the utmost importance, was left unnoticed; a manly, unequivocal, and impartial line of policy in dealing with sectarian agitation had become necessary, if it were only to prevent the time of the Legislature and of the Government from being absolutely prostituted in discussing matters which grow out of sectarian squabbling and jealousies—to prevent, in fact, the interruption of public business and private industry. But a far more weighty consideration should have directed the attention of a Government to this subject—it was one that involved the peace of the Empire. Yet here, again, the same tortuous line of policy was pursued; always trifling with effects; never dealing with causes; indicting Priests and laymen for being agitators and repealers, and coqueting with agitating Parsons, and that anti-catholic Repeal party,\* which by torrents of exasperating insults to the fondly-cherished national religion, goad into agitation and into the advocacy of extreme measures several of those Priests, and many of those laymen. It is not asserted that this was the origin of agitation for Repeal, but it has an effect on it, and has added to the Repeal Association many persons who otherwise would not have mixed in polities, as unquestionably a domestic legislature would, without any infringement on Protestant freemen's *rights*, have checked the abuse alluded to, and have prevented decency from being outraged.

There was another sin of omission, as related to the people of Ireland. It is true that the Exchequer was not rich when this government took office—true that it had to pay for the popularity of its predecessor, and to make good deficiencies not created by its own measures. It is also true that there exists considerable (but not comparative) distress in England as well as in Ireland. Still, an outlay of public money in Ireland is a debt long due, and should be paid. It would not have been *money wasted*; it would have compensated for *any sacrifice* made to obtain and expend it in national works here—it would have *most amply remunerated the Imperial fund*.

Ireland never asks from England any outlay for fancy or ornamental purposes, though England cares not for her consent when she lays out millions thus, herself, for such works—works which do not return to the empire at large one farthing profit; Ireland will show a return of quadruple the English rate of interest for any capital England will expend here. But even if there were not great and immediate gain, is the Government to say

\* Protestant petitions for the Repeal of the Catholic Emancipation Act are prepared, and the Government has been addressed by these Repealers; but this Repeal agitation is tolerated.

that they never will assist in alleviating distresses or in developing resources in the Irish part of the empire, unless they get usurious interest, if not prompt repayment? Let individuals say they subscribe when there is a famine,\* and soldiers prime and load when wretchedness ceases to be torpid! Would there be no direct return to the public treasury by governing so as to render unnecessary a standing army, now kept up at the enormous expense of millions? The British Government soon found *twenty millions* to pay for a change in the condition of the lower classes in the West Indies a few years ago—money sunk without one penny of return. No doubt it was a most benevolent outlay, but there was no destitution in that case; not one pauper (according to the spirit of the word) in those islands, and the whole slave population did not in numbers amount to a fourth of the poor of Ireland, whose privations and distresses are incomparably greater. The aged and infirm, too, were provided for. In Ireland there are above two millions of paupers, multitudes of able-bodied unemployed men, and some millions of acres of reclaimable land lying waste. Irish distress had a decided claim to more immediate attention.

This Administration took office when there was a great strain on Irish patience, and it had been long fine-drawn; still the history of the last ten years, and, above all, a knowledge of the good temper and patience of the people of Ireland, establish the fact that they would not have pressed for any extreme measure, if some moderate ones, *really useful to them* had been brought forward. It might almost be said, if a reasonable hope had been held out to them, that such would have been taken into consideration!! and that their complaints would have been enquired into!!! Yet EVEN THIS WAS FLATLY REFUSED when Mr. W. S. O'Brien's motion was negatived by a ministerial majority.

No Government of the present day can have any valid excuse for ignoring the popular bills of grievances. They are well aware that the people complain, and that there is even more than a *prima facie* case for investigation—that there is a clear one for redress. The people seek not to retaliate past injuries but to remove a painful existing pressure. This is demanded by a voice which cannot be silenced, and by a class with which it may be dangerous any longer to trifle.

\* The benevolence of the English people to every nation in distress, whether from war, famine, or any visitation of Providence, is universally and gratefully acknowledged.

## CHAPTER II.

PRECURSORISM—PREMIER'S COLLEAGUES—HIS FIRST SELF-CREATED DIFFICULTY—THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON—LORD STANLEY—SIR J. GRAHAM—THE TORIES OF 1829—IS IT TOO LATE?

THE present Government entered into power, whilst the echoes of the warning voice of the Precursor Society were vibrating on official ears. That voice placed repeal as an extreme alternative.—The terms were “*Justice or Repeal*,” in other words, “*do justice to us, or let us do justice to ourselves*;” there was an offer from a whole nation to abandon an indictment for a notorious fraud (the Act of Union so carried), which if prosecuted before Europe and America, must be followed by a verdict for the plaintiff; and not only an offer to abandon, but to consign the recollection of it to oblivion on the easy terms of instalment repayments from the successors of those who deprived them of their rights. Probably this offer may not be made again on terms so easy.\*

Sir Robert Peel had full opportunities of knowing exactly how far each person whom he called to office, would travel with him on the popular road—so that the first of his difficulties may be called a domestic one, for he summoned around him some of the most unpopular of the Whigs, and least moderate of the Tories.

Lord Stanley, high in character, eminent in talent; in youth the distinguished soldier of constitutional liberty—in maturer life, alas, its goaler—had been impitiable toying with the mutilated remains of the Irish franchise, and created on this, and on other occasions a very hostile feeling towards himself—Lord Stanley's secession from the popular cause is a calamity.

\* Perhaps Sir Robert Peel and some of his colleagues would have attended to this appeal, were they not overruled. The writer cannot bring himself to believe that Sir Robert Peel would be an unjust and illiberal minister, if associated with a majority of liberal men; perhaps too, he might again find a supporter in the Duke of Wellington, were his Grace less guided by party connexions, and less influenced by military habits. The writer recollects the bitterness with which the parliamentary party he was associated with in 1829, assailed these ministers, and how unflinchingly they adhered to the broad principle of justice to seven millions, in preference to adulation of a party. The straightforward Repealers of Ireland would not respect a man who was unjust to any class, especially towards a party he long conscientiously acted with, and as conscientiously retired from. The writer, therefore, takes this opportunity of asserting, that though the Anti-Catholic members of 1829 were liable to the charge of prejudice, they were quite free from a stain of corruption. They clung to principles which their leaders wisely deserted, and be it remembered, that those leaders had power and patronage. They had placed Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington in power, warmly supported them, and only conscientiousness on both sides could have *then* separated ministers and ministerialists. The writer has always been of opinion, that a clever, but an old *ruse de guerre* was played off against the anti-ministerial party of 1829, by giving them a General from the enemy's camp. He could give sound reasons for this opinion.

Sir James Graham was differently situated, he had no popularity to lose—he excited no expectations—disappointed no hope, but the state of public affairs rendered it imprudent to select a person for the *most important office as regarded Ireland*, who had forfeited the confidence of his own party without obtaining that of his quondam opponents.

The Duke of Wellington is undoubtedly one of the best, and best rewarded general officers in the world, and a senator of considerable ability ; but he has publicly turned his back on the country he was born in. He is an Irishman by birth, his family estates are in Ireland—and a third of the men whose last drops of life-blood made a Duke of him, was Irish. The Duke of Wellington has become unpopular in Ireland, because his Grace's name is associated with some measures much disapproved of by that nation, and with vigorous opposition to others popular in the empire at large; but his name is also coupled with one, the Catholic Relief Bill, which would have made it easy for his Grace to take a very high position in his country's affections, had he not expressly stated that he advocated that—a measure of justice—on the narrow ground of expediency. There is also a strong feeling of pique against the Duke, associated with great disapprobation of his polities. The general peace was proclaimed twenty-nine years ago, His Grace has resided during that time, within two days' journey of his native land, and was often within ten hours' sail of her, yet never paid his countrymen the compliment and respect of a visit, though Irishmen had had so large a share in contributing to his Grace's elevation !!!

The objections to other members of Sir Robert Peel's cabinet have been before the public : there may however be amongst the present Government, and the official personages holding office under it, materials for forming a prudent and possibly a not unpopular administration. The same may be said of the Whigs. The Irish nation however, though prepossessed strongly against certain personages in the cabinet, was prepared to think more of government measures than of government members. The people would have met, and, it is to be hoped, will yet meet justice with cordiality, and kindness with gratitude—but oppression will produce resistance, constitutional, as long as human nature should endure. A mixed government, however good might be the intention with which it was formed, was not likely to work well. It could not possess the confidence of any large class in Ireland. The Aristocracy is (generally speaking) Tory ; the people, now rather inclined to Radicalism. There is also a considerable and highly respectable Whig party composed of portions of the high Aristocracy, Gentry, and of some of the people, but there were too few Whigs in this government to secure to it Whig support, and to please the Irish Aristocracy.

as a body, Toryism should be Lord of the Ascendant. A full Tory administration would be less embarrassed than any other in bringing forward liberal measures, for its own party would bear with any concessions made by a ministry so constituted; that is, a full Tory one. The tory party can consistently oppose measures which spring from the Whigs, but the Whigs could not, after such strong professions, oppose liberal measures, no matter what quarter they came from. There are many objections to mixed governments; an unnatural coalition destroys the stimulant to popular acts—opposition is the stimulant, and that being paralyzed by a junction, each party, for fear of breaking a truce growing out of necessity (it would be unfair to assume it to be a sacrifice of principle), takes its stand on opinions which they had held in common, and the opinions which Whigs and Tories hold in common, being any thing but popular, measures grounded on them often savour of the errors of both parties, without a solitary qualification emanating from the better feelings of either.

Persons who write on political subjects should not take up their pens to comment harshly on individuals or to try to display satirical powers in abusing Governments, it is as easy as contemptible to be bitter and rude. Writers should endeavour to support principles not to point sarcasms. It should be the object of all who love Ireland, who know the value of a constitution, who revolt even from the idea of a reformation achieved by blood, and from any system of government which can be upheld only by periodical appeals to arms—it should be the first object of all such, by petitions, by addresses, by writings, to endeavour to rivet the attention of Government on the fact that, however persons may differ on political or religious questions, Tory, Whig, Radical, Catholic and Protestant, Aristocrat and Peasant, in an immense majority agree that Ireland has grievances, and that dealing by Proclamations, Indictments, or by force of arms, with what is called sedition, should not be the *sole occupation of a Government having full knowledge of the notorious fact that these grievances exist.*

No Administration has acted by Ireland so as to be entitled to propose conditions to her by way of a *preliminary to justice—JUSTICE SHOULD BE DISPENSED UNCONDITIONALLY*—favor may demand terms. Ministers seem to know no mode of suppressing discontent and its consequences—agitation—but by force. It never enters into their plans to endeavour to diminish the agitation muster-roll, by giving the people (not their leaders) something more solid to occupy them; they never try to undermine popular discontent by justice or kindness, they generally prefer gunpowder. Most Governments act on the principle of not reducing the debt to the people, but of postponing the day of reckoning; and when an instalment of tardy justice is wrung from

◎

the reluctant hands of Ministers and their parliamentary followers, it is but too often rather of nominal than intrinsic value, marred by the jealousy aristocracy ever entertains of popular power. Repealers may be of opinion that it is almost too late for retail justice (certainly so for conciliation on any minor scale), nay, may wish that Ministers, as they have forced them (the Repeal party) into a struggle for a constitution, should remain in their present disadvantageous position and continue their false manœuvres which must *ultimately* ensure a Repeal victory.\* Such a consummation is indeed inevitable unless interfered with by either of two events: the first is, the Government undertaking just, extensive, prompt, and conciliatory measures; this is an improbable contingency. The second is, by a wild attempt to achieve independency by force. That is a rashness next to impossible **UNDER THE PRESENT WELL-REGULATED SYSTEM OF THE ASSOCIATION**. But whatever might be the opinions of Repealers, a Government should never *decide that it was too late to be just*. *They have no right to inquire with how much justice the people will be satisfied—but what is due, and pay it.* They might be assured that they could never lose a point by acting thus; they would have sound reason for firmly believing that the agitation of any popular measure would be carried on temperately, and in the best feeling, by the influence of just and paternal measures; they might calculate to a certainty that all possible danger of outbreak would be averted; and they might be sure of eradicating from the minds of many, that hopelessness of redress which may have created, *in some*, vague resolves to avail themselves of any embarrassments into which the Empire might be plunged, in order to enforce *then* infinitely more than what they would have been contented with if yielded to friendly remonstrance.

---

### CHAPTER III.

THE MONSTER DIFFICULTY, AND MONSTER GRIEVANCE, AND MONSTER EVIL—BIGOTRY AND BRITISH SYMPATHY—BILLINGSGATE PROSELYTIZING—SLANG DICTIONARY PIETY—CHRISTIAN CHARITY INCULCATED BY INSULT, AND CONVERSION FROM ERROR PROMOTED BY GROSS ABUSE—REAL PRINCIPLES OF ORANGEISM.

As relates to the empire, the present Government had to grapple with many difficulties, not of their own creation. Some were entailed by their immediate predecessors who, as before stated,

\* The writer uses the word *ultimately*, for he never was sanguine as to immediate success, and differed widely from others, and considered and considers success far more remote than they did or do.

enjoyed the popularity of certain measures for which this administration was obliged to provide.

The awful evil, sectarian virulence, alluded to in the first chapter, cannot be attributed to any Government, though they are all responsible for not making vigorous exertion to check it. Systematic outrages are perpetrated in the name of the law-established religion on that of the nation. This is the bane and curse of Ireland. This is the agitation which so often prevents salutary measures from being dispassionately advocated by one party, or calmly investigated, or reasoned on in friendly spirit by the other. Sectarian animosity is the origin of almost every feeling of wrath, of jealousy, and of suspicion, which separates Irishman from Irishman, and Ireland from England. It is the prolific parent of every thing calculated to rend the bonds of society, mar national prosperity, and endanger not merely the peace but the fate of the Empire.

It cannot be difficult to grapple with and crush any agitation which is not founded on a real grievance; this could therefore be checked. It springs from one of three causes—great prejudice, vicious bigotry, or motives of self interest. It is always a good plan to take the most charitable view, so let this be called conscientious error. The necessity of suppressing its baneful effects is not less imperative. A bold and strong cabinet denunciation of such a system would effect much, and has never been resorted to. Why not treat this as Repeal agitation has been treated? If it originate in self-interested motives try it by the Repeal test, and it will wither under it. Declare all persons joining in violent *sectarian* agitation and in *systematic insult* to the religion of their fellow countrymen, whether by attacks published in tracts or uttered at public meetings, shall be dismissed from the magistracy, and hold no place of honour, trust, or profit.

If it originate in an error in judgment, deal with it by remonstrance from the Royal Head of the Protestant religion.\* Even the earthly head of a Church should have weight with the body; and should not the agitation yield to this, still its irritating tendency will be impaired, if not destroyed, by showing that it is not countenanced in high places. If it originate with the tribe of Diotrephes,† in sheer love of ascendancy and strife, which are other terms for bigotry and selfishness, ministers ought to know how to deal with that which tends to breaches of the peace, and to bringing all religion into disrepute: there are legal enactments enough, and precedents, too, on record.

Out of the language and conduct pursued towards Catholics and

\* The Queen's name has been used by Ministers to check Repeal agitation; why should it not be used to check a system of insult to the religion of a Nation?

† 3 John i. v. 9, 10.

their Clergy has grown a great deal of the outcry against the temporalities of the law-Established Church in Ireland. The people believe them to be the bone over which the possessors stand growling, and thus exciting attention to what many might have passed by without stopping to notice. The people, certainly, were heavily oppressed by tithes ; but the Composition Act greatly lightened the pressure. It is, however, still too heavy to need the extra weight of abuse from those who are living on it. There is a wide difference between tolerating a religion, and tolerating its members to insult and assail all who dissent from it. There are the Unitarians in great number in Dublin, and highly respectable persons amongst them, avowing that creed ; and a regular school for Unitarian children, &c. This sect denies the Divinity of Christ, yet there is no Evangelical crusade against it or its clergy ; but there is a regular system of persecution, exclusive dealing, and gross insult kept up against the Catholic who agrees with the High Church and Evangelical Protestant on this, the fundamental doctrine of the Christian Religion, and differs from the Unitarian. There are no insults heaped on the Quaker, yet he rejects the Sacraments altogether—treats them with utter contempt—but they are heaped on the Catholic who venerated these Sacraments (which the Evangelical and High Churchman venerated also), and venerated them rather more than others do—here is the head and front of the offence for which he is insulted and suspected ! In what state would the Empire be if the Catholics of Ireland retaliated the abuse they get and the treatment they receive ? or if each sect were to attack the other with the virulence a large portion of persons professing some varieties of Protestantism assail the Catholic, his Church, and his clergy ? A thousand wild cats let loose in a small room would scarcely depict the “*state of the country*.”

What is the boasted freedom of thought, which we are told it is the noble characteristic of Protestantism to enjoy and to bestow ? Does it mean, down with Papists ? What is the Protestant’s interpretation of ‘the word Toleration, the principle which it professes so loudly to uphold. Does it mean No Popery ? What means “the glorious right of private judgment,” on the free exercise of which the whole Protestant religion is based ? Does it mean, that the right of private judgment is *Protestant private property*, and that if a man’s private judgment does not lead him into some of the many varieties of their Protest (three-fourths of which are admitted by orthodox Protestants to be but *different modifications of human insanity*), he shall not use his private judgment under penalty of desperate attack ? What is the Catholic Emancipation Act ? Is it an act to unchain and enlarge Catholics, for the purpose of hunting them and their religion down, with the High Church war-whoop or evangelical tally-ho ?

Are men fit to rule the destinies of a great Empire who have not the moral courage officially to denounce language (formally submitted to them, as Ministers by the authors) of which they (the Ministry), it is to be hoped, strongly disapprove? Are they not confirming the authors in error? and leading the assailed party to believe that the *calumnies heaped on them are abetted by those in power*. Are Ministers thus coy when dealing with popular measures, or violent language on the popular side? Yet, insulting the national religion;\* open attempts to proselytize Catholics—by traducing the Priesthood, by misrepresenting their creed; and by rewards—and by giving ribald and blasphemous nicknames to the holy sacraments—in short, by every thing that can lash a Catholic from the path of peace into tortured rage—all this is the regular trade of itinerant and stationary Protestant agitators, clerical or lay at this moment.

This is a much more important difficulty than merely Sir R. Peel's difficulty; *this is Queen Victoria's difficulty*, and will be the difficulty of each one of her Majesty's successors, until some change takes place. It is the most probable source of civil war, and if separation ever ensue, and that Catholics are engaged in promoting it, it will be found that ninety-nine out of every hundred of that creed who may be actors in the revolutionary ranks, had entered them smarting under the goading provocations stated. Such language is applied to the Priesthood as no human being would venture to apply to any man in the community but a priest without calculating on being knocked down. Some of the comments on the religion of above **SEVEN MILLIONS** of human beings (not attacking any other *form of worship* whatsoever), are such as no man, who has any respect for decency, would quote. Suffice it to say, they have all the coarseness of slang, and all the affectation of cant. These shocking epithets are showered on the Catholic population of Ireland, by a section which though alas! abetted by a large and important body, might, as regards themselves, almost be swept into the sea by the hisses of the millions they insult. But those insults, borne on the mighty wings of the Press, travel through Europe: tis therefore, they cannot be treated with silent contempt. It is impossible that these things can be done with a view to convert Catholics; no human being was ever converted by being insulted, and by hearing his creed

\* The Orange Society was perfectly harmless, compared with the Sectarian Political Societies of the present day, more insult, more slander, more gross abuse of the National religion and clergy, and of a Catholic people, are introduced in one tract, one speech, and in one publication now, than the whole Orange body ever put forth. Orange Societies were formed on the following principles—to preserve a Protestant, and prevent a Catholic ascendancy; but not to exasperate, or to bully, or seduce Catholics from their form of worship, or to interfere with it at all. Every Orange outbreak was a violation of Orange rule, which expressly forbid insulting or assailing any man on the score of his religion.

treated with brutality ; it may, nay must, confirm a man in error, if in error he be, but it never will lead to calm investigation and reflection ; and of what value would be any conversion not based on these ?

Is it consonant with common sense to expect Catholics to remain calm and unruffled when called **SUPERSTITIOUS BIGOTS—SPAWN of ANTICHRIST, and DAMNABLE IDOLATERS!!!** Language such as this is circulated by societies **HEADED and SUPPORTED** by several Protestant Clergymen, by *Magistrates, Members of Parliament, by Peers*, and by numerous bodies of lay Protestants !\*

Protestants of this Empire ! imagine clubs, societies, and bodies calling themselves “colonies,” regularly incorporated, for the openly avowed and expressly stated purpose of bringing your religion into disrepute—of **EXTERMINATING IT!!!** that is the word used ! Think of a rural press regularly established for the *sole* purpose of circulating attacks on your creed and of vilifying its ministers—Protestants of England, suppose a handful of English Catholics daring to placard your religion in the public streets, calling yours an apostate church ! your creed, idolatry ! your Clergy, merchandizers of souls !—and then reflect how Irish Catholics must feel under similar provocation ! Protestants, ask your hearts are Priests without excuse for taking a prominent part in a political agitation, the success of which would probably relieve them and their flocks from paying for abuse.†

\* The writer has read language almost as gross as this in printed bills attached to the railing of a Protestant Church ! in the City of Dublin, to the number of six, about two feet square. He has seen it posted in large placards **VERY LATELY** along the walls in the outlets of the capital of this, a Catholic country, and this abuse of the religion of the Irish Nation, **IRISHMEN ARE TOLD BY THE PRESS OF THE EMPIRE**, is received in England **WITH ENTHUSIASM, WITH ACCLAMATION, CHEERING, AND WAIVING OF HANDKERCHIEFS, &c.** and yet men calling themselves “rational,” wonder that priests and their flocks will not cling to that kingdom and to Protestantism, kiss the rod, and turn the other cheek, and pay with perfect good humour the men who are insulting them, and pledging themselves to exterminate the Catholic creed.

Catholics and Protestants are joint proprietors of several of the principal nations of the earth. In some, Protestants are more numerous, in others Catholics, but on the surface of the globe there is not one nation but Ireland, where there exists a bad feeling between them ; no where else do Protestants set a crusade on foot to extirpate Catholics by bullying, insulting, and seduction.

Each party in those countries looks to the piety and conduct, and morals of its own members, and there is something to do in Ireland in that way for the clergy of both religions, but the fact is, a conversion is a sort of triumph here, and but too many persons act as if they would rather hear of one man apostatizing to their creed, than of a score of instances of virtue in their own congregation.

† It would be grossly improper to introduce in this work one sentence which can offend a pious Protestant ; on the contrary, the writer emphatically asserts, his feelings towards all pious and liberal-minded Protestants are affectionate and respectful. He never can be brought to believe that hein fringes on those feelings, or on the abstract principle of justice, by stating that he considers it a clear violation of equity, that a Catholic should be made to contribute one shilling directly, or indirectly to the support of the clergy who protest that his creed is damnable and idolatrous.

It has been proposed by Protestants to pension the Catholic Clergy; and proposed in terms more than harsh and ungracious. The Catholic people of Ireland are opposed to Religious State Establishments, and Protestants wrong them much if they fancy that Catholics only want to substitute a Catholic for a Protestant ascendancy.\*

Protestants prove by the proposal to pay Priests that they could command an extra fund for that purpose; why not, then, pay their own clergy with this, instead of compelling Catholics to do it. That extra fund would more than cover the deficiency occasioned by the loss of "Papistical contribution." Why prefer so absurd a system as that Protestants should pay a Catholic Clergy, and Catholics pay theirs? That is just the way to make both Clergies indolent and meddling politicians, not religionists—brawlers, not preachers—bigoted, not pious (*Alieni appetans sui profusus*), coveting other flocks, careless of their own.

If Protestants value peace, they should pension into quiet those fiery spirits of their own religion who are sapping Irish attachment to England, endangering national peace, and bringing all religion into disrepute.

It has been peculiarly unfortunate for Sir Robert Peel and his colleagues that *these violent and provoking sectarian agitators in both kingdoms call themselves his adherents, and his Government THEIR STAY AND STRONGHOLD.* In the name of God, the Queen, and the present ministry are perpetrated all these outrages on Irish Catholics, clerical and lay! Would that their Protestant fellow-countrymen knew the friendly sentiments of Catholic hearts towards the worthy and liberal portion of the Protestant public (*it forms a great majority*), "who, whilst they steadily uphold their own creed, do not attempt to outrage Catholic feelings or trample on Catholic faith. Pious men of any religion will always be temperate in language, and thus insure respect for themselves, unprejudiced investigation of their doctrine, and studious abstinence from coarse comment on their tenets.† Oh, that men would remember they are but a confraternity of sinners, recol-

\* The writer is of opinion, that a clergyman, when paid directly by his flock, will always be more pious, more pure and more diligent in attending to its spiritual interests; and, precisely for these reasons, less rudely officious, less of the itinerant orator, and less anxious to force his religious opinions on others than to implant, nurture, and watch their fruits amongst those committed to his charge, if he has any such. The writer sees objections against all alliances between a free state and any particular form of Christian worship, and refers the reader to the observations of one of the most distinguished men of the 19th century, the Right Hon. Sir J. Mackintosh, Bart. See *Vindicia Gallicæ*.

† The writer has conversed, many hundred times, with priests and lay Catholics on the Protestant religion, and in the course of his life, never heard a rude, an insolent, and still less a brutal, or ribbald observation on a Protestant tenet. The expression of Mr. Blount, a Catholic writer, is constantly applied by Catholics to the Protestant religion—"that when strictly adhered to, it is a very benevolent system of Christianity; " but the writer must add, in the conscientious opinion of Catholics, imperfect.'

leeting, also, the parable of "the mote and the beam," and the hallowed mandate, "judge not, least ye be judged."

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### PROTESTANT CO-OPERATION—SOLICITUDE TO OBTAIN, AND CONSCIOUSNESS OF DESERVING IT—SECURITIES TO PROTESTANTS—CATHOLIC JURORS—CONFESSINALS—PROTESTANT CONFIDENCE—ANATHEMA.

It is the duty of Catholics, who constitute so immense a majority of this nation, to strain every nerve to satisfy Protestants, that, in the event of Repeal, their religion, their persons, and their properties should be respected in the fullest sense of that word; that they should enjoy exactly the same protection as those of the Catholics. *Every security which human ingenuity could devise should be given in this vital matter*; and though it may, nay must, be impossible to remove chimerical fears and far-fetched suspicions, still even these should be treated with gentleness.\*

It is not for a Catholic to suggest, it is for Protestants to say *what would satisfy them*; what would set their unjust suspicions at rest. It is deeply painful when friendly sentiments are thus expressed, to hear them met, as they so constantly are, in these words: "We will not trust Papists;" "We don't believe them;" "We could not believe their oaths, for their Priests would tell them not to keep faith with Protestants."†

Horrible as is such language, the Catholic yet endures it in the hope that "God will open the eyes of Protestant hearts and understandings." But is not the inconsistency of such wild notions quite glaring, when it is notorious that a Protestant judge will hang a Protestant on Catholic evidence! Is not this monstrous? If Protestants seriously believe Irish Catholics to be a nation of perjurors, is it not a burlesque on justice to call them on *any* juries, or swear them at all? Will nothing awaken Protestants to the inconsistency which makes Catholics be treated as unworthy of credence or trust to-day, absolutely as perjurors, if to be sworn

\* Such perfect confidence has the writer in the sense of justice, and in the good feelings of a large majority of the Protestants of Ireland, that if Ireland obtained a domestic legislature, he would gladly support any measure to *secure* to them *one-half of the representation* of Ireland, though they are but *one-eighth* of the population.

† The writer heard this atrocious effusion of prejudice, corruption, and bigotry, from a Protestant, D. L., a few days ago, and this man would unblushingly call himself a Christian.

on a political matter, and deal with them to-morrow as credible witnesses in far more serious affairs?

It is indefensible that an Irish Law Officer of the Crown has removed from the Jury which is to try five or six Catholics every man who used the same form of prayer, whether he were a Repealer or not, yet in this case men are to be tried only for a misdemeanor; and when that Law Officer gets on the bench, and has to decide on a case affecting life and property, he will swear and credit "Papist" witnesses.\*

As for striking off Repealers from a jury to be empanneled to try Repealers, few men will complain of that—*no man ought*—be the Repealers Protestants or Catholics, it was just to select them for striking off—but it should be a matter of indifference to any just or impartial man *whether he struck off a Catholic or a Protestant Repealer*, and *equally a matter of indifference* whether he kept on a Catholic or a Protestant non-Repealer.† Why, then, were any non-Repeal Catholics selected to be struck off? Why were Catholics who had kept totally aloof from Repeal agitation selected for exclusion from a jury empanneled to try five or six co-religionists? Does not this, in the *clearest manner*, prove that the party represented by that Law Officer has not confidence in a Catholic, whether he be a Repealer or not? The plain inference from the exclusion is, that Catholics are not considered to entertain the *same* horror of the awful crime of perjury that their Protestant fellow-subjects do.

There is not a religious Catholic in Ireland, and religious Catholics only frequent the confessional (the sacraments of any form of religion are frequented only by the religious), who would not peril the rights of his country and his own life,‡ on the veracity of the assertion that in no confessional in the British Empire is latitude given for the commission of even the most trifling sin, and perjury is one of the greatest. *In none, in fact, is advice given which a pious Christian parent would not, on his death-bed, give to the child of his affections.*§

\* How would Protestants feel if five Protestants were to be tried for a political offence, and if Catholic officials selected for exclusion every Protestant on the panel, and composed the jury, as the Court and every official belonging to it was composed, wholly of Catholics.

† It was no imputation whatsoever on a Repealer to leave him off a jury to be empanneled to try Repealers. He must have considered them guiltless, or he ought to have separated from them. A Repealer who had feelings of delicacy would decline being on that jury.

‡ Willingly, joyously, would the writer submit his to the test.

§ The writer ought to know the confessional better than those unchristian and evil-disposed men, who blaspheme its sanctity by the foulest fabrications, but who never entered one. He became a member of the Roman Catholic Church, in mature life, after much prayer, reading, and reflection. For several years, he almost every Sunday, has received and still receives, and shall so (D. V.) continue to receive Holy Communion; thus, he must have attended confessionals, from forty to fifty times each year during that period—and he has attended the confessionals of very many priests in several parts of Dublin, and of Ireland, England, and the Continent.

In all confessionals the real obligation of an oath—if binding towards every human being—would be treated in its proper light, namely, as being quite as binding a compact between Catholic and Protestant as between Catholic and Catholic. The monstrous calumny that Priests would give absolution for, or countenance intended sins, is too revolting to be commented on.\*

The writer asserts, in presence of the Searcher of all Hearts, after an intimate knowledge of the Catholic Clergy, that he has the clearest reasons to know they would denounce, in the plainest and most unequivocal language, every description of crime—**EVEN IN THOUGHT** (if not thought of with detestation), **AS DRAWING DOWN THE WRATH OF GOD**; and would call rebellion, or *any act of violence whatsoever, a crime*, and would distinctly state, that without a *true, a full, a solemn, and sincere declaration of repentance* for every *sin*, or **SINFUL THOUGHT** of sin, they **COULD NOT** and **WOULD NOT** give absolution to the applicant, or allow him to approach the Holy Communion; using words to this effect: “ You may deceive me, but you cannot deceive God, and, unless you be repentant, my absolution avails you nothing, and you are but aggravating your guilt, and entailing on yourself eternal punishment.”†

Much has been written on the tedious subject of sectarian feud, but it is of paramount importance. Protestant amity, Protestant co-operation would be the result of Protestant confidence. It is no degradation to the Catholic Christian to bend low and bear much to obtain this. It is a Christian duty at the sacrifice of pride to remove prejudice; and Protestant confidence once obtained, each Catholic will utter from his heart—blighted be his earthly hopes, defeated be his projects, and disgraced his name, who would betray it.

\* A man called *Reverend*, after a public dinner at a Liverpool orgie of bigotry, undertook in ribald language to detail what the priests say in the confessional—may Heaven turn his heart; he began in low ribaldry, continued in the grossest slander, and finished in blasphemy; for which, wine or brandy was a miserable excuse.

† The exact words used in absolution by the Catholic Clergy are to be found in the Protestant “Book of Common Prayer,” and are a part of the Protestant Rubric or Orders.

ORDER TO THE PROTESTANT CLERGY.—*See Visitation of the Sick.*

The Protestant Clergyman is ordered to give the absolution in the dying hour. The Catholic does not approve of postponement. Protestant readers are earnestly requested to refer to their Prayer Books.

## CHAPTER V.

NEGLECT OF IRELAND—INJUSTICE—MOCKERY—DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE NATIONS—ROYAL YACHT—PROFUSENESS TOWARDS ENGLAND—PARSIMONY TO IRELAND—PARTIALITY—INSTANCES OF GROSS NEGLECT AND WRONG—BOARD OF WORKS—EARL FORTESCUE—MARQUESS OF ANGLESEA—LORDS LIEUTENANT—TWO OF ENGLAND'S POWERS PARALIZED.

NOTHING can be more inconsistent than the course pursued towards Ireland by all Governments, and nothing more easy to refute than the arguments by which their adherents endeavour to uphold their policy.

The Irish are told that they are a *dependant people*—that *they must be so held*, that England is their “*OWNER*,” by a mixed right—half deeds of blood, half political corruption—half battle, half purchase; that she will maintain, *by force of arms*, the *right* so acquired. This is bold and open; and, in perfect keeping with this, England adds, that she will direct *Ireland's financial affairs as she pleases*—have the sole controul of her revenue—*transplant her treasury, impose taxes, regulate her commerce and manufactures*—restrict the cultivation of any commodity which would compete with *England's other dependancies* (as tobacco, &c.) All this, too, is quite consistent, and Ireland, then, with equal consistency, says—“as we are to be *your dependants*, as you pronounce us *unfit to manage our own affairs*, and put our property into *your chancery*, deal with that property as the property of lunatics is dealt with by a court, *cause it to be managed to the best advantage for us*. But, perhaps you will be pleased to tell us that we are not quite *non compos*; only infants in the eye of British law, *minors and wards of your chancery*, still you are *bound to make your receivers manage our affairs to the best advantage*, until you are pleased to cut our leading-strings, and declare us men. Your receivers would be amply paid for their trouble, and you would not be merely *paid for your justice*, but certain of enormous profit, and our property would be improved to the benefit of ourselves and of the empire.” The moment this appeal is made to England, her tone, *but not her system*, is quite altered; “you are our dear sister,” says she, “you have the most beautiful country in the world—you are a fine, brave, kind-hearted people, you have equal rights, privileges, and advantages with us, greater resources—*DEVELOPE THEM YOURSELVES.*”

All Governments theorize about Ireland, *make their half yearly haul from both tenant and landlord, merchant and trader, rich and poor*, in the shape of revenue, and then tell us to settle our affairs any way we can; now and then, rolling in a little apple of discord,

like the Tithe Bill, the Poor Law Bill, the Arms' Bill, &c. &c. Ireland is then left to play nation, and draw on fancy for independence—of which England gravely assures her she possesses ample for every useful purpose. When Governments tell the Irish to develope their own resources, and pay them empty compliments about their soil, &c., the Irish have a reply which always cuts British oratory short—“ restore to us the *principle of vitality* ; and, warned by the miseries of the past, sensitive to the sufferings of the present, we will, with divine assistance, create a fund, and progressively develope our resources ; and having the fee of the country, as well as of the land vested in its inhabitants by the possession of a constitution of which a public fund, a treasury, are some of the results, we shall be a good security for the outlay of your capital, and it will be infinitely a more profitable speculation for you to take capital to Ireland when she is a self-governed nation, than whilst she remains a dispirited and dependant province.”

Self-created grievances in Ireland could be dealt with, and cured by domestic legislature more effectually than by any other form of Government ; and the various evils consequent on British mismanagement, still more imperatively demand home-treatment. What would be said of any man who preferred consulting a London doctor by letter, to the personal investigation and constant attendance of a first-rate Dublin physician ? Who can blame England for treating the Irish as mad or imbecile, when they, year after year consented without murmur to take such a course, and when Irish gentlemen now combine to stigmatize themselves as unfit to be trusted with the management of their own affairs. Who can blame England for doubting the propriety of entrusting national business to men whose intellects she, from their own declarations, must believe, and perceive, are weak ? and accordingly, she thus “ reasons ” with the people of Ireland : “ Observe how we develope our resources; yours is a fine kingdom; you have great resources, and an ample population—all our great works are not done by the treasury. We reclaim land, make railroads, set on foot steam works, &c. &c. Our **millionaire** traders, our **Prince** merchants, our £10,000 a-year **RESIDENT GENTRY**, our enormously rich and numerous **resident NOBILITY**, our comfortable Yeomanry do these things for England—go Ireland and do likewise.” Let Ireland be heard in reply, “ You dragged us into a war, loaded us with your debts, robbed us of the classes you have enumerated—you have drained our resources; you have seized on our treasury; you have inveigled our wealthy aristocracy to live amongst you *by shutting out the sun of Royalty from us, and allowing it to shine only on yourselves* : by grasping every particle of patronage and using it for enriching **English**, or for corrupting **Irish gentlemen**, you rent up society by the

roots, by transferring the aristocratic assembly, the national legislature; you destroyed our capital and banished our capitalists, by regulating and controuling our commercial, manufacturing and financial arrangements to suit your own interests, regardless of ours; you have irritated our clergy by a torrent of insult, and have compelled us to pay yours for acting as conduits to this lava-like torrent—irrigating our “Papist souls,” with streams of red-hot Protestant love; and, having done all this, you have the hardihood to reproach our remaining gentry and our people with not being able to REPAIR THE RUIN YOU HAVE SPREAD OVER THE LAND, our clergy with not sitting easy on your gridirons, and our people with not enjoying the tragedy you have enacted. You take our moulds, and you bid us coin; rhapsodize about our having a full share in power, in money, and in the advantages which might result from being consolidated with you, and finish by *mocking us* with the name of SISTER. No, Ireland wishes to be, but is not your sister, she is just what you have made her, what your Prime Minister has called her, “*your difficulty*,” and *through your oppressions first, your bribery next, your mismanagement after, your neglect lately, and your rashness now, she is more than your difficulty, she is YOUR REPROACH.*”\* Is this Ireland’s fair share of influence in the British legislative body? England’s power there, when it comes to voting, is, as 1003 to 133, being above eight to one against Ireland, and the whole population of England, Scotland, and Wales, is but eighteen millions and a-half, Ireland’s is above eight millions. Thus, the difference is not two and a-half to one in number, and the account stands thus:

SIZES, 2½—1.					
House of Peers, ...	...	450	Peers,	...	28
of Commons, ...	...	553	Commons,	...	105
England, ...	...	1003	Ireland, ...	...	133
8½—1 AGAINST IRELAND.					

One hundred English peasants vote out of every four hundred, and only one single peasant out of each four hundred in Ireland. Is this a fair proportion as to a constituency? What a *modest assumption* on the part of *England*, that *she is just a hundred to one more worthy of this constitutional right* than Irishmen. That an English peasant is one hundred to one more *intelligent* than an Irishman—is not this *audacious insult*?

Now, to meet the assertion that the Irish Nation has had, and has, *its fair proportion* and share of outlay of public money. Nobles and gentry of England, especially you distinguished Noblemen who uttered the memorable expressions, “war to the knife sooner than independence for Ireland.”—Peers and Com-

\* These and all other charges are brought against an Oligarchy, not against the noble People of England.

mons of England, stand forward before the Empire and say, that the proportions stated, as to the representation and constituency of Ireland, *are in accordance with the RIGHTS OF MAN*. Then look to the surfaces of the two nations, and point out anything that corroborates your assertions—that public money has been distributed in just proportions. In proportions which bear the remotest comparison.

Look at your magnificent, your truly imperial public works, carried on at imperial expense—but by which you alone benefit; your splendid public buildings, your quays, docks, arsenals, dockyards, your countless Employés, from the daily labourer to the Duke in office; all receiving from the UNITED purse, all (except a miserable few,) spending it, returning it as it were, not to the united purse, but to the sole advantage of the *strong* sister's population—amongst whom ALONE the whole of the money collected from both nations is expended. Look now, how in a few months, for one Royal Gem of the sea, in one English town, you spent £100,000 from the joint imperial purse. With Irish as well as English money was the Royal Yacht built—and yet you advised the Sovereign of the Ocean, to turn its glittering Prow from her Majesty's own twin-isle to that continental stranger, to that nation of which for England, and *England's sake alone*, Ireland had been for ten tedious years of mortal strife, the deadly antagonist, bathing with Irish blood the soils of four nations; and was it not afflicting to her—your sister and your ever-faithful ally—to her, but once honored by the sight of royalty *coming in peace*, that yearnings of loyalty were disappointed, warm hearts were chilled, fond hopes were blighted, and that the Morning Sun of the British Empire first beamed upon the land of England's hereditary foe. Where is the defamer of royalty who will say, that the Sovereign of these realms was deterred from visiting any part of them, by a declaration from one of her Majesty's subjects, that the people intended to petition their monarch? Where is the monarch who would be so deterred, or would shun an opportunity of seeing his subjects, and of hearing their complaints? The people of Ireland firmly believe that they owe their disappointment to ministerial influence—as they are aware that in far minor matters, ministers claim a right to arrange. The Scotch noblemen in the cabinet, did their duty by their country, and by their Sovereign—Scotland was ably represented in that cabinet; Ireland, alas, has not one voice there, patriotism and loyalty can go hand in hand in Scotland—but in Ireland patriotism is called sedition. It is not intended to convey an expression of regret in the language of reproach, save so far as ministers are concerned, in not having suggested Ireland's respectful claim to *priority* of Royal notice.

Is it necessary to point out the gigantic expenditure for ships of

war, and all such outlays in England. It would be almost superfluous, if indeed it were possible, to enumerate all the palaces and all the enormous state establishments, all the profit, all the outlay, all the benefit of the annual expenditure, all the show, all the ornament on England's side. On Ireland's, the cost, without a fraction of return, a particle of decoration, or even a formal compliment, a peep at what they pay for, in return—some war steamers and the soldiery excepted.

England should remember her grant, a few years since, to one small district in Scotland, nearly two millions, for the Caledonian Canal, a work of comparatively little public advantage, and this sum was granted from the *joint* purse of Ireland (ruined Ireland,) and Great Britain for the express purpose, as the parliamentary documents state, of *preventing* the Highlanders from emigrating. Yet, emigration is England's *only cure* for the diseases her mismanagement *annually* creates here.

Five hundred thousand pounds were granted some time ago for public works in the empire—England thus *divided* it, and was it the division of a *SUBJUGATRIX* or of a sister? As usual, she played the *subjugatrix*, and sent her Irish dependant £50,000, one-tenth, and under such mean and injurious restrictions, that she quite damaged the effect of her niggardly instalment. She has a Board of Works presided over by an efficient public officer, Major-General Sir John Burgoyne, assisted by gentlemen equally entitled to respect, and confidence, Messrs. Ottley and Radcliffe, yet she would not place this paltry £50,000 at their full disposal, under the sanction of even the Personage whom she calls the Representative of *Ireland's* Sovereign, but keeps that Personage in the leading strings of her Treasury Lords. It was enough that the money was to be doled out for Ireland, so England kept it under the sole controul of men, totally unacquainted with that country—in fact of Englishmen, resident in England; refusing her own intelligent officers here, who knew Ireland—which few of her lords of the treasury ever set a foot in—refusing her own, and Ireland's Sovereign's Representative the power of laying out the small sum actually assigned to Ireland, to what they had the best right to know was to the advantage of the nation.

The following cases may be relied on as facts; they are stated by the person [the writer is that person] who was connected with them all; who has transacted business several times with the Board of Works, and who is now within correction of that Board if he fall into any misstatement.

As a county Grand Juror [Galway] he got a presentment passed for a line of road, the want of which had, long excluded from the only market towns in the barony about eight thousand persons, so far as using a car to take their commodities for sale. The Board of Works had the power of lending (to

be repaid by instalments) as much as the county granted—the whole was £1,000. The Board commenced the work, made a mile at each end, then said they regretted the money was all expended, that the sum had been insufficient, and that they had no fund on which to draw for the completion of the work. Their having commenced it caused the people to cease applying for the annual presentment for repairs, and thus the case was far worse than when the Board began; for the centre two miles became quite impassable, and their work was, therefore, money lost.

In vain, thousands remonstrated by petitions, &c. The poor people were shut up by sloughs, by deep ruts, and by broken gullies, &c. This continued a considerable time. The Board at last replied to this gentleman “that if he got a further sum from the county they would lend as much more, and finish the work.” He was compelled to act as they suggested, and on this occasion took their own officer (he had before employed the county surveyor); he got that officer’s estimate, brought it before the Grand Jury—and a more liberal and benevolent Grand Jury never was embodied than the Grand Jury of the county of Galway at all times—and again obtained £1,000, the sum estimated. The collection of it from the people commenced, and the lodgments were paid into the county treasury, to the credit of the Board of Works, and there it was remaining unproductive—and there was the work untouched—and there were the people shut up and most seriously impoverished and injured by want of a passage to market; and this in a part of the county the manufacture of which (kelp) had just been destroyed by free trade; and in the whole district, thirty miles, there were but three resident proprietors, of whom the narrator was one. He applied to the Board, month after month, pointing out that it was actually a fraud on the country (that is on the people) who had paid the money to the treasurer, to the credit of the Board, and had gone to all the expense and trouble of the presentment, at the suggestion of the Board, and on the valuation of their officer.\* He reminded the Board that they had put the Grand Jury to the trouble of discussing and passing the presentment, and this after having disappointed the county in the first instance: that their own work—one thousand pounds on the county—was useless, and that sum was, therefore, thrown away, though wrung from a very poor population. Sir John Burgoyne was anxious to do justice, but wrote to state that “the Lords of the English Treasury had made a *new rule*; that he sincerely regretted he could not now proceed with the work; that he admitted the facts stated in the remonstrance, and was very sorry that the Board could not take any step whatsoever in the business.” Sir J. Burgoyne added, it was a case of great hard-

\* A gentleman resident in Clifden (Mr. Pearce,) who fulfils his important duties with ability, impartiality, and universal approbation.

ship!" The narrator then proceeded to Dublin (thus taking a journey of 300 miles *on public business*), waited on the Lord Lieutenant, Lord Fortescue. His Excellency also saw "the *extreme* hardship" of the case, and requested the applicant to meet Sir J. Burgoyne with his Excellency *next day*, at the Castle, in the audience-room. He did so. Sir John, with that candour which has gained him general esteem, corroborated to the Lord Lieutenant all that the applicant had stated, and again distinctly characterized the transaction as one of the "greatest hardship," and expressed the strongest regret at the late regulations. The Lord Lieutenant said "he *fully concurred in that opinion*;" "but," said his Excellency, "*I have no power in this case; I cannot direct the outlay of a farthing, though the money is granted for Ireland as well as England, it is ALL AT THE DISPOSAL OF THE LORDS OF THE TREASURY IN LONDON.* All I can do is to *write now at this desk*, and entreat them to do something for those poor people who have paid their money on the faith of an arrangement entered into with a Government board. I shall take care to point out that a thousand pounds of public money (the people's) has been already expended, which must be dead loss unless the rest be given, as arranged." The applicant then said—"My Lord, some of those Lords of the Treasury may have been at school when your Excellency and I sat in the same house, as senators; only one of them ever saw Ireland; and yet your Excellency, the Representative of the Monarch, cannot order the fulfilment of this contract!—cannot order the disbursement of one penny of the paltry instalment granted for Ireland by a United Parliament!—by Irish and English members!—you cannot do this without asking the leave of English Lords of the Treasury! *My Lord, I am not a Repealer, but if I ever become one I shall state this case, and assign it as one reason for seeking domestic legislation, and shall refer to your Excellency and to Sir John Burgoyne.*" Both gentlemen are now alive, and one of them in office in Ireland, and the narrator appeals to their honour and to their memories to bear him out; the occurrence is but four years' old.

The following is another instance of the want of a Domestic Legislature, and these are affairs in which the vital interests of from twenty to thirty thousand Irishmen were at stake. Mr. Martin, M.P., had a contract for several miles of main road, opening above twenty miles of country, and a passage to the assize town for the population of two baronies. He handed over the county money and contracts to the Government; the money was squandered by *Government officers*, the work was left quite unfinished—*bridges half built*, and the road impassable to cars!! The people were deeply injured; not to speak of the annoyance, there was actual danger—and accidents constantly occurred, resulting from this state of things—yet it went on for several years;.

an old and dangerous mountain path\* being the sole entrance to the whole district, forty to fifty miles in extent, with a population of over 30,000.

The narrator, then in Parliament, presented a petition to the House of Commons from the barony. Mr. Martin, M.P., whose whole life has been devoted to the improvement of that part of the country, toiled unceasingly to obtain redress; and long in vain. The narrator waited on Lord Anglesey, then Lord Lieutenant. His Excellency said, “it was a sad case; that he was greatly shocked at the cruel way in which the people were treated—that the Law Officers of the Crown had been consulted about prosecuting the defaulters—that he would do his best, but he feared it was a hopeless case, as he really did not know out of what fund the deficiency was to be made good, and that certainly he had none at his disposal. These were his Excellency’s words, transcribed after the interview. England appropriates all Ireland’s revenues, and then lends her a minute portion of them under the most galling restrictions, and generally appoints English or Scotch gentlemen to dole out any scanty pittance for the Irish, under the controul of British Lords of the Treasury. England leaves Ireland dependant on the whim of those English lords, for the completion of a half-executed work, commenced under the orders of some previous set of lords. In the last case cited, the Government after pleading insolvency, and hide and seek for several years, paid the debt to the county, and made the road—and the revenue of one town in the district amounted, in a few years, to what the road cost. Thus was an actual fraud committed on the inhabitants of two large baronies, and unatoned for, for several years, and also an annual injury to the revenue to a large amount.

Could such a state of things have existed for years in any country on this earth where there existed a home government? or if that country had been fairly and fully represented elsewhere? and what is the improvement in the way of doing Irish business now—what is the wise new rule of the English Lords of the *United Treasury*? In substance it amounts to this: “not to grant any money to any district in Ireland in which there is not a wealthy landed proprietor, or a peasantry in good circumstances.” For in every case they require that *some person*, or some body of persons, shall advance half the money or the Treasury will give *no assistance!!!* This supposes a wealthy proprietor, or wealthy population, for none others can give half. If a rich gentleman want a pretty pier or quay, or road to his shooting lodge, he might perhaps get it made at half price, by advancing half the cost himself, *but if a poor fishing colony want security for their all, their lives, boats and nets—if they want a place to run into amidst the*

\* Made for thirty miles, by an ancestor of the writer’s.

*horrors of Atlantic storms, by which hundreds of lives have been within a few years lost* (and this loss is regular, and annual;) if *this class want protection and aid, if in fact the real resources of the country want development—and where do they want development so much as where the people are poor but industrious*, and can by timely aid establish means of procuring a livelihood, as fisheries, reclamation of land, &c. &c.?—yet for these purposes *not one shilling will England give from THE UNITED PURSE—refund* is the more correct expression. The person who has narrated has been the actor in those scenes now laid before the public. He is the writer of this pamphlet, and has a document in his possession signed by the resident officer of the Board of Works, by officials of every class, clergymen, travellers, engineers, peasants, fishermen, and by several captains of vessels which put into the harbour in distress, all urging the necessity of a small pier at a well known fishing station on the western coast. He has a copy of the report of the officer of the Board of Works, and the *Board has the original*, stating that the *increase of the revenue* would probably *soon, and amply, pay for the outlay*, and that the safety of passing shipping as well as common justice and humanity to a fishing colony—bold and indefatigable, but necessitous—all *required such a work*; and what was the reply of the Lords of the Treasury to the beforementioned applicant? “ You must go to all the expenses of surveying, mapping, &c., about £100; and you must, yourself, pay one-half the whole cost, be it £1,000 or £10,000, or you may collect it from the poor fishermen *if you can*, but this you must forthwith lodge, or we will not advance a farthing or commence the work.” Would they say this to the wealthy inhabitants of the coast from London to Ramsgate; though every square mile of it contains more wealthy persons than were in the whole district here spoken of? No, they would not; for it would then be an outlay for the protection of *English lives, and English properties, and English steamers, and English fishing-boats, and pleasure-boats*.

It is needless to go extensively into the case of Ireland’s direct injuries from the Union. Mr. John O’Connell, and the indefatigable Mr. Staunton, Mr. Dixon (an English gentleman), and many other able calculators, have proved how deeply Ireland has suffered in every source of a nation’s prosperity. The instances cited in this *brochure* falling within the immediate observation of the writer, are introduced to show the local effects of neglect and mismanagement. England has every power over Ireland save two—she has not the power of withdrawing one favour, or of inflicting a new wrong.

## CHAPTER VI.

FEDERALISM, AND FANCY LEGISLATION—VARIETIES OF PLANS—  
INDEPENDENCE DEAD AND BURIED—RESURRECTIONISTS—  
THE MILLIONS.

It is an instructive view of human nature, to observe how many gradations of patriotic feeling the Liberator has called into existence ; and an amusing one to remark the awkward efforts, at what they fancy is patriotism, made by some who never knew the meaning of the terms “ Native Land ;” who never *felt* they had a country, who lived only for themselves—who thought it the highest proof of human sagacity to be able to say, “ I am not of any party, I never meddle with politics,” in other words, I am a native of *nowhere*, and I take an interest in *nothing*, but **MYSELF**. I am a member of the community, but I recognise only number *one* in it, and that is **MYSELF** ; I read my Bible, and interpret the holy command, “ love one another,” to mean, “ *I am to love myself, and myself is to love me.*”

By the time the independence of Ireland has rolled down the hill to this class, it has become “ so fine by degrees, so beautifully less,” that not one particle is visible, and it glides into the silent tomb. This is then its posthumous state, and around its grave are to be found a few persons chaunting in funereal tones their invocation to the members of the British House of Commons, to come over and visit the sepulchre once in three years !

It is melancholy to hear Irish gentlemen saying, “ they would go this far”—this far ! So then, this is a strain, a sacrifice on their part ; of what, pray ? A compromise between servile devotion to England and a *forced fancy* for Ireland. We will leave these Mutes grouped amidst the ruins of their, alas, *their* country, and proceed to some resurrectionists who would raise Ireland from her sepulchre. This class goes much farther than the party talking about Ireland’s posthumous prosperity, having duly consigned her to the grave of total dependence ; for thus an unrepresented nation lies. Can any man who loves his country, reconcile it to himself to cajole the people into the delusion, that a visit once in three years from some three or four hundred English gentlemen would be any equivalent for a Constitution ? The resurrectionists take a far more just and rational view of Ireland’s degraded condition, for they would vivify the first lifeless proposition, by a **FULL** and **COMPLETE** representation of Ireland in the parliament to be held once in every three years in Dublin—and Dublin, if convenient to the Queen, and to Prince Albert (on whom her Majesty’s movements, in so great a measure depend) to be, for that season, the seat of royalty.

Every one should set the proper value on the lustre of royalty, but it should never be mistaken for, or put into the remotest competition, with the divine orb of liberty ; constitutional liberty, not licentiousness—and this can never be achieved but by a full popular representation. The occasional visit of a Sovereign, would be tinsel compared with the sterling advantage of extension of the franchise. Extension of franchise and representation, combined, would certainly produce results very beneficial to Ireland; and it is perhaps an experiment, not unsuited to the times—one however which, *Repealers* could not be expected to descend the hill to propose. Though certainly they ought to lend their aid to every measure calculated to improve their country.

There does not appear to be any intermediate stage, at least, none on which there is footing between this and *Federalism*.

It is not an unfair definition of *Federalism*, judging by the supineness of its professors, to call it “ the dormitory of drowsy patriots ;” a sleeping stage on the journey from slavery—which they admit to be a term descriptive of Ireland’s state—and an independence they consider visionary, but millions believe to be practicable.

It requires, it seems, great mental efforts to arrive at the conclusion that Ireland should have *some trifling share in the management of her own affairs*, when men retire to rest after adopting that opinion: thus it is with *Federalists*—they say Ireland ought to have a demi-parliament, for local business—and having said this, they yawn, retire, and go to sleep.

Several persons before they became *Repealers*, no doubt, made enquiries for *Federal Hall*; but in all Dublin there is not to be found, one man to tell the enquirers where the *Federal* place of meeting is; and very probably, even if they did discover the locality, and the road to it, no one would be up at the stage to let them in.

The *Federalist* establishment is used as a place of refuge by those who prefer theoretical to working patriotism, who consider a mere declaration of that principle is a payment in full of an Irishman’s debt to his country, and enables him to strut in all the honours of demi-patriotism (when awake) without entailing exertion or *outlay*, or *incurring any risk*. It is totally unnecessary to say, that in these comments (and they are not intentionally disrespectful to any one,) not the remotest allusion is intended towards Mr. Sharman Crawford, the Rev. Mr. O’Malley, the Hon. Mr. Caufield, and a few others.\*

\* Mr. Crawford possesses the confidence of his countrymen, whether he differ from or agree with the majority. He is at this moment one of the most distinguished leaders in the great popular movement in England (with which the writer has now the honor to be connected). Every project for the improvement of the poor man’s condition, and for the proper extension of constitutional liberty has had his vigorous and untiring support. If *Repeal* has as yet proved

Mr. Crawford may rest assured that whenever he states he has brought his plan to an issue, *Repealers* will not attempt by overt or covert means, to create a prejudice and prevent the fair working of the project; on the contrary, they would labour to test its utility, for any reasonable time. Every legislative measure is experimental; at all events none should be called final before trial. Mr. Crawford has important avocations in England, it would be unreasonable to expect him to be an active Federalist; it is as well, however, to submit to him that his assistants are lethargic, and *that delay in calling them together is injurious to Repeal, without promoting his project.* The Rev. Mr. O'Malley has but just returned to Ireland, and is a valuable accession to Mr. Crawford's project; so is Colonel Caulfield, a gentleman whose mind ennobles a noble descent. There is one of Ireland's most distinguished sons, whose accession to the popular party has been anxiously expected. The truly patriotic conduct of Lord Clements, last year, has endeared him to every Irishman who loves his native land, and has assigned to his Lordship a place in their respect and confidence which neither mere rank nor wealth can ever obtain. It will not injure the perfect or imperfect principle, either Federalism or *Repeal*, that those projects should be brought separately before the legislature. A Federalist is culpable if he decline to ask for what he considers justice, on the plea that *Repealers* are, in his opinion, demanding too much; neither have Federalists a right to ask *Repealers* to disband a single man who is enrolled as a constitutional combatant for the restoration of Ireland's undivided right. But on the other hand, *Repealers* would greatly err, if, because they could not obtain their own object, they should endeavour to defeat that of Federalists (or any other body of persons interested in the welfare of Ireland), on the ground that it fell short. Its insufficiency, if it be (as *independents* believe,) insufficient, will be very soon ascertained, and then Federalists become bound in honour to proceed, not retrograde or remain stationary.

Ireland's grievances are very old; Federalism, a very new remedy, and yet slumbering; *Repeal* is on foot a considerable time, and most active; Federalists cannot in reason ask veteran *Repealers* to return back and become federal recruits. There is no natural connexion between religion and politics; but in Ireland they are so entwined that every plan for the improvement of Ireland has its religious as well as political name—so Federalism is called “*The Protestant Project*”—would it could be called “*Movement*,” it is of pure Northern origin; and any

the exception, it is only because he thinks Federalism more feasible, and desires to see it get a fair trial.

The writer has the honor of being lately in confidential correspondence with Mr. Crawford, and was so some years ago.

emanation of patriotism there, though a modern novelty, is but a return to the ancient principles of the men of the North. Northerns are not afraid that Irishmen *alone* will be unable to prevent anarchy and confusion in Ireland. This they have proved by tendering their services to Government, and by repeatedly published declarations that they are able to preserve Ireland as an appendage to the British Crown ; and so any one man of them is, and at this very moment he would enjoy a comfortable sinecure, for there is not the slightest idea of rebellion at present. The Protestants of the North have not been tainted by the fears of elderly Protestant gentlewomen, who imagine worse than murder would be perpetrated on them but for the soldiers quartered in Dublin and Cork. North-country Protestants are not afraid of being left alone with their Catholic fellow-countrymen. They did not borrow their bravery from the fancied protection of British bayonets, when they lately offered, if embodied into yeomanry, to be guardians of Ireland, and to put down rebellion, should it break out. They did not mean to offer their services to shoot their pacific, peasant countrymen, and it would be an insult to the gallant British Army—to the disciplined troops of a nation, nearly double the amount in population, to insinuate that they were not able to put down an insurrection in Ireland without yeomen aid, when it is notorious that it would not be countenanced by the bulk of the people. In such a case, an offer to join the regular army would amount to a statement that all England is not able to keep a portion of the unarmed peasantry of Ireland in check without the aid of all the Irish Protestants. This cannot be fact, and a superfluous tender of Protestant muskets in that case would be an officious and sanguinary display of second-hand courage, more likely to do harm than good. The Northerns must have meant that they needed no British aid. If this was not what they meant, it is to be hoped the term, Northern Valour will be expunged from the annals of loyalty. But the noble blood of their sires, the men of 1782, is not extinct, they are patriots by descent, and probably so at heart ; their loyalty has, however, run wild and overwhelmed their patriotism. They erroneously imagine that there is a collision between patriotism and loyalty in the Repeal principle ; they are egregiously mistaken—there is no measure which so effectually provides against separation ; but if they have a doubt of this fact, if they will not support the independent principle, the Protestant Northern project, Federalism, is before them, suggested by Protestants—why not support it ? If the Protestant patriots unite, they are a most powerful party ; they have certainly more influence with English governments than Repealers have, and will find little difficulty in arriving at Federalism, whilst Repealers perceive that there are great difficulties between them and independence. Fe-

deralists have the good wishes and friendship of the Independents. It would be unreasonable to ask Repealers to retire from their more advanced position, or to expect them to chill the now glowing spirit of patriotism—to disband patriotic millions—to *repeal the union of hearts, based on one indivisible principle*—INDEPENDENCE—and above all, by retrograding to shew a doubt of that Providence which has mercifully guided them thus far without stain—untainted by corruption, undaunted by the sword, and unruffled by provocation. They will not then subdivide, they are as one man and will at present remain so, for the millions cannot be either bought or intimidated.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE SOLE OBSTACLE TO REPEAL—INOCULATED CATHOLICS—ST. BARTHOLOMEW—HYPOCONDRASTIS.

WERE Ireland all Protestant—all Jewish—all Mahomedan—there is not a second opinion as to the fact, that the demand for Repeal would be simultaneous and universal in Ireland, and the concession of it certain, on part of England. Whilst this establishes the fact that the advantage of domestic legislature is incontrovertible, it also clearly points out the cause and quarter whence proceeds any Irish opposition to it. The opposition is evidently sectarian, and nothing else, and originates in the chimerical fears of some of our respected and loved Protestant brethren. Some Catholics hang as a dead weight on the great national movement, and are thus, by pure *vis inertiae*, checks on the prosperity of their native land. Out of habitual deference to their Protestant friends (in some cases patrons) they have allowed themselves to be inoculated with a disease of the nerves (a species of *neuralgia*) appearing not merely to commiserate Protestants for their unworthy suspicions, but to share in them. Other smaller sections of Catholics have totally lost their own caste, but cannot obtain entrance into that before which they crouch, without giving up creed as well as caste; they have long accustomed themselves to bow down before each misruling government to show how loyal they were; and kissed the rod of sectarian oppression to prove that they had no religious prejudices. Of this class some have crept into the Houses of Lords and Commons under the Eagle wing of O'Connell, and then with puny strength, but leviathan ingratitudo, try to break the pinion which warmed them into political existence. The rest of the unrepealing Catholics of Ireland are, no doubt, conscientious opponents, or apathetic. This is said in sorrow, not in anger; with firmness, but also with respect.

It is to be deplored that out of all the saints in the Protestant

calendar, St. Bartholomew is the only one who holds a venerated place in their memories. It has been the misfortune of Catholics to hear frequently the atrocity committed on that Saint's day in France, three hundred years ago, assigned as a reason for suspecting the Catholics of Ireland in 1844. Catholics also, *repeatedly*, within the last few weeks, have heard it asserted by respectable Protestant citizens in Dublin, that they oppose Repeal solely because they believe that if a British army were not in Ireland, *the throats of all the Protestants would be cut!!!* May God forgive such criminal suspicions, and enable Protestant eyes to see into Catholic hearts: as well might the few Catholics of England live in terror lest their Protestant fellow-subjects of the present century should jump backwards into the horrors of the Reformation, and rob and murder as was the Protestant order of the day then.

As well might the Dissenters now tremble at the recollection of Servetus at the stake; burned to death in an overflow of *ardent* zeal by Calvin, Luther, and Company, as a Dissenter from the new orthodox, about which each of them however differed widely from the other. Free exercise of private judgment had just become the new general rule, and as all general rules are proved by an exception, Servetus was burned to establish a religious as well as grammatical aphorism.

With the exception of a little weakness about the ghost of "Bloody Queen Mary," which disturbs some, the Protestants of Ireland are men of high intelligence, benevolence, and patriotism, and if convinced of the safety, as they must be of the advantage of a domestic legislature, they would labour to establish it; but alas, many are impressed with the idea that *if left alive* they would be basely used as instruments, and dishonourably excluded from participating in the happiness and advantages it would confer; this is a deplorable delusion, a fatuous notion which no process of reasoning can remove. The man who takes it into his head that there is a conspiracy to poison him will refuse the most wholesome food and eat of the most injurious—will turn from security and rush into danger—will reject each friendly hand—call kindness treachery, and will remain in a house crumbling into ruin sooner than follow the sound advice of a friend and put it into repair.

All Europe could not be a guarantee satisfactory to such a man; nor could Coke, Bacon, and Blackstone, united, devise an enactment which would afford repose to his perturbed spirit, or banish from his diseased mind pharmaceutical fancies about prussic and oxalic acids. Time may teach suspicious religionists to do as three-fourths of mankind now do—smile at their weaknesses.

However Repealers may lament want of confidence and co-operation on part of those who differ a little from them in form of

prayer, they cannot be expected to make a national struggle dependent on anything which they know to be chimerical. The people of Ireland are now pledged to seek that relief on a wholesale scale which they had for forty-three years been humbly soliciting to obtain even by small instalments.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

CABINET ERRORS—NINETY-EIGHT—PEASANT SHOOTING—LORDS OF THE SOIL—SLAVES—FREEMEN—MISREPRESENTATION.

THE great source of British misgovernment towards Ireland is British ignorance of her people and of her wants, not British inhumanity. It is a manifest injustice to compose a Cabinet which is to regulate the affairs of two different nations, exclusively of the natives of but one of them, and the absurdity of this is the more glaring, when it is recollected that England admits it is necessary for the well-being of all parts of the empire, that they should be represented in the Commons. As to the idea of twenty-eight Irish peers being of the least use amongst 450 English, it is too absurd to notice. So then it is of wondrous import that a handful of men should have the privilege of making complaints, and that this handful should be Irish, but it is forsooth of no consequence at all that any of the men who are to investigate, and in fact decide for or against redress, should be Irish. It is no reflection on the talents of men, some of whom never saw Ireland, others who saw it but for a brief time in their youth ; others who paid but a flying visit to its capital, to say that they are utterly unfit to act as her agents. No member of the Cabinet knows this kingdom, its capabilities, its deficiencies, its wants, and its people as the ruler should know the ruled, or the Superintendent should know the Principal and the property he undertakes to manage. It is charitable to suppose ministers believe as some portions of the English and Scotch press tell them, that if the Irish have any ideas of their own, they fall under the heads of hatred of law and of order, thirst for blood-stained strife, contempt of comfort, and love of total idleness ; too indolent or too stupid to think for themselves, and too excitable and silly not to adopt at once each rash proposition, or rush into desperate crimes suggested by any interested adventurer ; no matter how self-evident was the folly of the first, or how manifestly injurious must be the consequences of the latter to themselves. That this may be justly asserted of a few in some parts of Great Britain and Ireland, is fact ; but that it applies to more than a few in either, or is peculiar to Ireland, is untrue.

A small section of the Irish nation, composed of half-resolved

rebels, irritated to madness, and of some frightened wretches, goaded to despair, got up what is called the insurrection of 1798. The English at that period, and the amateur belligerents, who then played soldiers, and assisted at the "battues" of peasant shooting,\* easily disposed of the comparative few who were engaged (and of some who were not); the rebels too, were frequently betrayed into their hands. Not having any fixed purpose or plan of action, they ran wild as over-driven oxen; did mischief alike to friend and foe, and were soon knocked on the head.

The facility of so dealing with this medley of victims of oppression—of dupes—of the lawless—of the once forbearing—of the heartless and of the broken-hearted, has led to an erroneous impression, and it is now assumed that the Irish and the Esquimaux Indians are alike ignorant and afraid of gunpowder. That a display of fireworks can always render invisible the (supposed) minor light of patriotism, and that blood-letting is the only cure for periodical excitement in Ireland. This is the doctrine of the *loyal* physical force party who upbraid the people for "not going to Clontarf," "in disobedience of the proclamation;" thus to accommodate their sanguinary propensities, by rushing *unarmed* on pointed bayonets, and bringing matters to a *crisis*, *when one party was ready for slaughtering, and the other unprepared to act on the defensive.* It appears there are physical force men in the *Government* as well as on the Chartist side; and there are *some* in Ireland quite ready to indulge them, were they not restrained by the influence of the true friends of this country, and of the empire; and what is more, by the true servants of the God of peace.

It is unnecessary to combat the absurdity of assuming, that a rebellion in Ireland could be dealt with as in 1798, or to comment on the universal ruin consequent on one shot into a crowd now **WHEN TWO MILLIONS OF MEN WOULD FEEL THE WOUND.** May Heaven grant the incorrectness of the opinion, "that nothing but fear hinders the Irish from rebelling," may not be practically proved. All good, all wise men will echo that prayer, and will best inculcate the doctrine of peace, by pointing out at once the sinfulness and the ruin of civil war. It is degrading to an Irishman to be compelled to descend to combat the idea that the Irish do not fall within Locke's definition of a human being, and can neither reason, compound, nor compare. The faculty of abstraction, is certainly peculiarly English. One of the causes whence has arisen the contempt for Irish intellect evinced by an English oligarchy, and by much of the highly talented and highly prejudiced press which it patronizes, is that feudal influence (the

\* This expression refers to the fact, that numbers were shot who were not rebels.

real remains of barbarism,) long lingered here. There was also a most uncompromising, and therefore irrational, adherence to English Kings, after the good sense of that country had displaced them. These things have induced our neighbours to consider us always a century or two behind them in civilization, and wisdom; our new lights being often their old ones. As to our loyalty, we got a *tolerably severe lesson* from Cromwellites and Williamites on that score. The law as laid down by England was this: Irishmen, if you do not rebel the moment we do, and join us in killing one King, and in hunting down another, we will visit you with fire and sword, and rob every loyal gentleman amongst you of his estates, and give them to our rebel soldiers, but if, at any time you should venture to exercise your own understandings, we will call that sedition, rebellious *avant courier*, and we will indict you, and put you to gaol, and make your nation one large guard-house.

As to the charge of feudalism, Ireland must plead guilty to having fondled that vice rather longer than England did. The Lord of the soil here, whether an oak of the forest, a transplanted sapling, or a mere mushroom, was still the Lord; and a portion of the attachment the Irish are notorious for bearing to their native soil, was bestowed on him who presided over it (whether he deserved it or not); and kind-hearted Rustics tendered fealty with a zeal suited to his position or hereditary claim. The ancient Chieftain (often of regal blood) got the lion's share, and the new comer received in just proportion. It is pleasing to see an attachment subsisting between landlord and tenant, but no man should value such an attachment unless it be *based on respect and esteem*, and these cannot result from any cause other than mutual worth.

The very worst effect of feudalism was the tenants' voting under its influence, making but one inquiry about a parliamentary candidate—"Does my landlord vote for him?" Nothing so directly tends to brutalize a people as to be taught to have no opinion on matters connected with their country's welfare, and, consequently, with their own; and nothing so thoroughly demoralizes a people as observing loose swearing at elections not merely countenanced but planned by persons in the upper classes of society.

Whilst the people continued callous to the reproaches of conscience and to the impulses of patriotism—whilst they voted under the orders of men whose employment was the fabrication of a constituency, and whose trade was a traffic in it—whilst the people upheld a system by which they and their Christian brethren of the same faith in England were oppressed\*—and whilst they elected as their representatives men who strenuously upheld that

\* It is scarcely credited on the Continent that a Catholic population voted regularly for candidates who voted and spoke against Catholic Emancipation.

oppression—men who first sold the nation by wholesale, and afterwards its rights, privileges, and liberties by retail—whilst the people did this, *so long they were not called* “a besotted populace and a demoralized mob,” as they are now designated; but from the moment that the masculine principle of freedom began to operate on hitherto enslaved manhood—from the moment they began to feel themselves no longer a proscribed race, and heard themselves hailed as fellow-freemen, they also began to hearken to the united voice of reason and of patriotism.

This, as a matter of course, led them to adopt the same enlightened view of Ireland as did Grattan, Bushe, Plunket, Curran, Saurin, and such luminaries; and, strange to say, from the very period when they dared to act on a coincidence of opinion with these distinguished persons, and thus, for the first time, established their claim to the most noble attributes of man—from that moment they were insulted, assailed, and misrepresented; their exercise of sound discretion—in voting for patriots in preference to place-hunters—was called ingratitude to their benefactors; respect for their religion and clergy, was bigotry and superstition; their appeal for justice to their native land, was sedition; patriotism was rebellion; and now, obedience to a law, however unwisely put in force, is called cowardice; for the people were charged by the anti-Repeal party with having staid from Clontarf through cowardice, not respect for the law.

---

## CHAPTER IX.

MISLEADING THE GOVERNMENT—DEALING WITH EFFECTS; CAUSES UNTOUCHED—GOVERNMENT CONTRACT TO FURNISH THE LIBERATOR WITH AGITATION SUPPLIES SCRUPULOUSLY FULFILLED—WHO DID THE DEED—ARMAMENTS MORE ORNAMENTAL THAN USEFUL AT PRESENT—PICTURE OF IRELAND.

THE people of Ireland, especially the rising generation, are thoroughly impressed with the invaluable importance of a domestic legislature, and they at least expect to see it yet established.

There is an influential class which misleads ministers on this subject, and induces them to fancy that if O'Connell were imprisoned and the Catholic clergy pensioned the national voice would be silenced—grievances be forgotten—misrule pass unnoticed and Ireland be with impunity consigned to that neglect she has a right to dread from those who negatived a motion stating that she had grievances; but if that negative plunged her into despair as to spontaneous sisterly sympathy and justice, it has animated her into the thrilling hope of self-won redress, though it may be granted on the cold ground of expediency—a ground where gratitude has no abiding place.

There is a second class which contributes also to mislead Government and prevent their arriving at the real state of the case, this class knows the truth and has to answer to conscience for withholding it ; timidity is their sole excuse ; they hear those who support their conscientious opinion that Repeal would benefit Ireland, branded as rebels, accused of seeking to dismember the empire ! when, in fact, the accused think that if their object were carried, such an event *possible now*, would be impossible then. Unfortunately, a salutary warning has been mistaken for a seditious cry, and a prudent caution to beware of postponing justice only to the period when England *may be in difficulty*, has been tortured into a base and dastardly hint to the people to rebel.

This sad misconstruction of good advice has terrors for some, but should have no influence over those who are conscious of purity of motive, and are deeply solicitous to see all *chance of collision* between now strongly-opposed parties, not merely postponed, but annihilated ; such may thus unhesitatingly address the government : “ You have stationed 40,000 soldiers in Ireland ; you have placed her ports under the surveillance of ships of war—you think these measures absolutely necessary to maintain Ireland as an appendage to the British Crown, or you do not ; if you do not, why resort to such menaces ; in such case they are insidious attempts ‘ to provoke the caper that you seem to ‘ chide,’ but if you do seriously believe that the integrity of the empire at this moment depends on an army ; that in fact Ireland is ripe for rebellion, will you meet the danger solely by increasing the military force, without reflecting that the cause remaining, the danger travels on, *pari passu*, if not more rapidly than efforts directed merely to grapple with it by military force *when it shall have reached its climax*, but not at all to prevent its arrival there.” This is absolutely staking the destinies of an empire on the result of a battle ; and it is a poor excuse to say that that dreadful consummation of mismanagement is not likely to take place in our time if the military force be looked to and kept up. This is the achmé of selfishness. Have we no children, and no property to leave to them ? Can any man who loves Ireland, and sincerely regards England, witness this state of things without raising his voice however feeble, and exerting his abilities however limited, to rouse government to resort to the only sure mode of averting an awful catastrophe ?\* will not the combined voice of patriot Repealers—of Federalists—

\* The Duke of Wellington cannot have forgotten his own expression to Lord G.— in 1829, when accounting to him for the steps he was then taking and the course he wished Lord G. to pursue ; that expression was too strong, too important to be forgotten ; it was uttered in *private life*, therefore the writer will not repeat it, but it was too momentous to have escaped the Duke’s recollection. The writer had the particulars from a British peer, a strong supporter of this government. The expression alluded to is even more applicable to this period than to 1829.

in one word, of Imperialists, and of all classes of Christian men ex-claim against the imprudence of dealing with effects and leaving causes untouched? will they not declaim against the monoptical vision of any government which acts on such a principle? If the government had contracted to furnish O'Connell and the Repeal Association with a supply of arguments and powers to work on the people, they could not have fulfilled that contract with more scrupulous fidelity—arguments and powers which have enlisted in Ireland's behalf the clearest demonstrations of European and of Transatlantic sympathy. With all the firmness of freemen, all the fervour of patriots, and all the peaceful but bold spirit of Christians, Irishmen should ask the government, do they seriously expect to establish permanent tranquillity in Ireland by means of 40 or 100,000 men in red coats—or by compelling O'Connell to address Ireland from Kilmainham instead of Burgh-quay—or by asking a parliament not too popular now, to become less so by passing a bill for the more rapid suppression of popular feeling and more prompt imprisonment of the only man in existence who possesses the affection of seven millions of human beings—not to speak of the others who are his fellow-sufferers, and of the Leaders of a Press which has endeared itself to the people of Ireland? Is it not in evidence that one popular leader collected, and what is more difficult, at a word dispersed millions of brave and bold men? Can ministers believe that he could have attained to that power if there were no *grievances*—no mismanagement—no misgovernment? Have they read the charges brought against them by their predecessors in office, and have they reflected on the sins of omission and commission they, in retort, attributed to their accusers? Suppose half of what each said of the other to be true—suppose half what is stated in parliament be fact—or suppose one party only has truth on its side, and only a moderate share to its lot, can they, as men of honour, venture to assert that Ireland has been justly and prudently governed; and that the Catholic clergy, O'Connell, and the Repeal Association have called into existence the discontented spirit which pervades this land, and have fabricated the grievances of which Ireland has so long complained?

Ministers and Governors of Ireland, pause, reflect, and ask yourselves if, without your cordial, fearless, and prompt administration of justice to Ireland, the Priesthood, O'Connell, or the Association, or least of all, your 40,000 soldiers can calm the popular mind; and if without redressing one wrong you can hope to extinguish general excitement and allay universal discontent. On what page of history, on what theory relative to the human mind do you ground the supposition that any civilized people are incapable of appreciating the advantage of a home government, or could be insensible to the loss of it or totally

unconscious of neglect or injustice on part of another nation professing to govern it on terms of equality, but in fact treating it as an unworthy dependant ; no people, except the Capadocians, whose name is therefore consigned to eternal infamy, ever declared themselves unfitted for domestic legislation ; and can you imagine Irishmen in the nineteenth century—Irishmen employed all over the civilized world, and universally considered intelligent and acute—quite ignorant of its value ? Especially after undergoing for forty-four years a series of injurious experiments made by a foreign (thus may be designated a non-resident) administration, the results of which experiments have been total decay of manufactures—annihilation of commerce—utter neglect of national resources—exportation of aristocracy—a deserted metropolis—absence of modern scientific improvements (as railroads, &c), in lieu of all which we have Ribbon Societies—party feuds—agrarian disturbances—Orange Clubs—bigoted and bitter sectarian associations—tract unions—proselytizing settlements—mid-day No-Popery meetings—midnight outrages—agitating clergy of every sect, without exception—demagogues—popular leaders—two millions and a-half of paupers—*eight millions of malcontents*—coercion bills—arms' bills—government proclamations—state prosecutions—new fortifications—war steamers—“ Spies ”—Repeal Associations, and a standing army !!!—so much for a forty-four years' experiment to carry on the business of a nation without a full representation, or a domestic legislature.

Where is the man who values truth, will venture to draw his pen over one item in this bill of particulars on the plea of its not being fact ? Some few in England assert that the Irish are weak-minded and unfit to have a voice in making the laws by which they are to be governed ; this reproach can be grounded only on the fact, that the patience of Ireland has been long practised on, not merely with impunity, but almost without remonstrance. The comment comes with a bad grace from British lips or British pens.

---

## CHAPTER X.

IMPRISONMENT OF O'CONNELL—A LANDED PROPRIETOR'S APPEAL TO THE GOVERNMENT—WHO IS TO LEAD THE PEOPLE ?—REBEL KINGS—RIBBAND-MEN.

RULERS of this empire, delude not yourselves with the vain hope that your difficulties, and Ireland's grievances and discontent will be in any way diminished by the committal of O'Connell, or that your beds will be of roses if you pass the threatened

gagging bill—*Malus est enim custos diuturnitatis metus, contraque benevolentia fidelis vel ad perpetuitatem, CICERO.*\* This parliament may pass it, but every free state in either hemisphere will denounce it, and any popular House of Commons will expunge it from the statutes, and could such a bill, or O'Connell's committal be the amount of your exertions for the aristocracy of Ireland? who now, opposed to their tenantry and countrymen in general, are clinging to you in helpless confidence, and perhaps in embarrassing dependence? Surely not. There yet linger hopes, that you will be influenced by the suggestions of those who practise peace and solicit justice, rather than by the stimulants of others, for whom civil war has no terror; for the heat and toil of that would fall on England; and some of the *spolia bellorum*, they fancy, would fall to them as such gory gifts of Government did to their predecessors. Such men dream of conquest, without reflecting on, or caring for the common ruin attendant on even one victory. Every man who does not fear to speak the truth will tell the Government that they are only postponing danger and tying down England's right arm.† There is not a landed proprietor in Ireland‡ who ought not thus to address the Government, “what security will there be for my property, and be it large or trifling, it is my all, and *I am one of a class in whom the fee of Ireland is said to be vested, both as trustees for the people, for the welfare of the state, and for our families.* I ask what security there will be for my property if the people lose confidence in those leaders who *enjoin, implore, almost command that peace should be preserved?* if the people imagine they are deluding them by holding out hopes, that a better form of Government would be attained by *peaceful* means.§ Of all other periods, was not this the very time when it became vitally important, by every means to divert the minds of the people from thinking of succeeding by force? Leading Repealers had not merely to caution them to beware of being dazzled by the success of rebellion in America (that has been long before them without leading them to rashness, though it misled the parents of many of them); but the advocates of peace had to struggle against the effects of modern examples of the triumphs of insurrection.

\* Fear is a bad keeper of that which is intended to be lasting; benevolence, on the contrary, will perpetuate fidelity.

† The writer may have placed himself under the battery of his college contemporary, and old and esteemed acquaintance, the Attorney General for Ireland. Such a consideration has not the slightest weight with a man who knows that he is doing his duty. He will therefore, remain in that position indifferent to danger, until that duty shall have been completed.

‡ Of course, all men having property, will take the same views.

§ Nothing so clearly proves how strongly Repealers inculcated obedience to the law, as the very fact that they said they defied the Government to prevent Repeal agitation. That was clearly upholding the principle, that as long as the people had the law on their side, no Government could put them down, for every peasant knew that illegal meetings could be put down.

Canada was before their eyes—France, Greece, Belgium, shewed them that rebel hands could bestow diadems, and rebel peasants confer the proud title of the “Lord’s anointed.” Does not all Europe at this instant, see rebel Kings in fashion, and scions of legitimacy cut? Have popular leaders no difficulty in dissuading the people to prefer peace, prayer, and petition, when they are looking at three royal ermines not yet dry from rebel blood, trickling from the rebellious hands which lifted subjects to the throne, and flung upon their shoulders the mantle of the Monarch. Ministers, and Ministerialists, do you fancy that the keen-sighted people of Ireland are blind to all you wish them not to see? that they cannot reflect on these notorious events, unless the Catholic clergy and O’Connell enlarge their understandings, and open their eyes. Would that you could be persuaded now to exercise the whole range of your own understandings on the events before you.

For many years, one of your ablest Journals\* has headed a column with the remarkable words, “state of the country,” can you venture to lay all that is to be found under that heading to O’Connell, who was then silent, and to the Repeal Association which did not then exist. BEWARE OF A CONTINUATION OF THE SYSTEM OF MISRULE—MISRULE, THE PARENT OF LAWLESSNESS: AND BEWARE OF THE SPREADING OF A COMBINATION WHICH IS THE MOST FEARFUL RESULT OF CONTEMPT FOR THE LAW. The Repeal agitation has checked it, ITS NAME IS SECRET SOCIETY—RIBBANDISM—its characteristics are midnight fires, midnight burglaries, plunder, and blood. Repealers denounced it, Repealers are its bane and terror, for they seek to substitute, not to destroy—to alter unwise laws, not to violate any. Soldiers and police will never exterminate Ribbandism.† In nine cases out of ten, they arrive when the mischief is done; but, the desperado who lives next door to a Repealer, lives next door to one of the national police. Repealers are everywhere, police are in fixed stations; the fear of Repeal Wardens, and Repealers, greatly assists in keeping down Ribbandism amongst those who want not the repeal of any law of God or of man—they break both with equal indifference.

\**The Evening Packet.*

† The writer speaks with the best feelings towards the noble imperial army, proud to have held a commission in it; and also with commendation of the police: for obvious reasons, he laments that a body so much in contact with the people were engaged in the State Trial affairs—it was an unwise step.

## CHAPTER XI.

## FIXITY OF TENURE—EDUCATION—CHURCH QUESTION.

**FIXITY** of tenure is not a well-selected term ; fixity is an obsolete word, meaning (according to all lexicographers) “ coherence of parts,” and nothing more. Like all other obsolete and obscure terms it misleads and does mischief.

Some landed proprietors think it so comprehensive that it will involve confiscation of their estates ; and some tenants fancy that this mysterious term includes reduction in rent, and no power to eject.

The proper term for the required arrangement between landlord and tenant is—**SECURITY FOR CAPITAL**. It would be a delusion to expect that any legislative measure would proceed beyond this, for it would be difficult to go further without perpetrating a fraud.

Labour is the poor man’s capital—for this he requires security. This is effected in different ways in different counties in England ; for instance, in Surrey, Sussex, Berks, and Wilts, the labour of the occupant and its results are more closely estimated than in other counties ; but in all, custom would secure at common law protection to the tenant for his outlay. In those counties allowances are carried to the utmost. If the landlord wished to re-enter into possession, he would not only have to pay the first cost of even a hedge-row, planted as a fence, but the increased value from its growth each year, inasmuch as a hedge of five years’ old is a better fence than one which had not attained to height, and the tenant would get the advanced price as a sort of interest on his first outlay of time and money. Ploughed land, ready for sowing, would be valued inclusive of the cost of ploughing. Fallow land and manured land would be estimated with a proper compensation for loss of time whilst in fallow, and the value of the manure would be fully estimated. In other counties the valuation is not so minute—but in all, the tenant is protected, and would be paid for his improvements according to the rate established by custom in the locality.

Nothing can be more consonant with justice than that the tenant should be amply remunerated for any necessary improvement—nothing more unjust than to give him a right to be paid for anything which is not necessary, unless an agreement to that effect be made previous to his commencing the work. When any law is passed to regulate arrangements between a Letter and a Taker of land, great caution will be requisite if the act have an *ex post facto* reference, and it would be a hard case that it should not, for good tenants who *have* improved should be protected by

the proposed new law. The utmost care will, however, in these cases be necessary, for deep injury might be unjustly inflicted on some benevolent landlords, as well as on others of a different character. Instances of this could be easily given, but they would occupy too much space in a pamphlet touching on several subjects.

Those Irish landlords who are afraid of being ruined by improvements made by their tenantry, know very little of the Irish peasantry. They may be pretty certain that for the next half century such a revolution will not take place in the minds of the peasantry as would convert them into ornamental and fancy farmers. The children of the present proprietors (not to speak of this generation) will have ample time to provide against the effects of speculative innovations on the approved methods of farming; nay it is to be feared that a very long period will elapse before even the recognized principles of good farming will be generally adopted in Ireland. The Irish people are much attached to old customs and habits, and the taste for improvements will not progress too rapidly.

Arrangements between landlord and tenant, enactments to give security for capital, whether consisting of money or labour, will be of considerable service; so will the introduction of national works, *on a great scale* (none else would be of any use), and immediate evidence of this will be afforded in a country which responds to the slightest encouragement, and has survived so many centuries of oppression, mismanagement, coercion, and neglect. Measures, however, which are applicable solely to the physical condition of the people will be greatly impaired in their value, will, in fact, be rendered of temporary instead of permanent utility, unless accompanied by one which will bear directly on their moral condition; EDUCATION must form the principal part of any system calculated to effect the permanent welfare of Ireland, or of any nation standing in need of it. Goldsmith very justly reprobated the paltry and now hacknied maxim of Pope, "that an honest man was the noblest work of God." Taking the word honest in its plain and ordinary signification, this was a truly degrading view of humanity, and almost an impious one of the power of the Creator. A man, to be "the noblest work," ought to be something more than not a thief—he ought to be in a condition to be an actively useful member of the community. Honesty is but a negative virtue. Goldsmith himself took a very poor view of human nature when he described as "the Golden Age" the period when "every rood of ground maintained its man;" that must have been the halcyon epoch in rural life, ere shoes and stockings were heard of, and when shirts and trowsers were deemed superfluous luxuries. Local attachments, supineness, and that sort of indolent content which grows out of ignorance or indifference to comfort, are injurions to *nations* as well

as to individuals. A mud cabin, and a particular acre of boggy or even fertile soil, in which a man's grandfather happened to have planted a potato, would not be either over valued or battled for by a peasant who was taught by education to *feel* himself qualified for a more extended sphere. Such a man would revolt from the idea of settling for life on, and fighting for, the miserable corner, so sentimentally lauded in Goldsmith's pretty *Bucolic*. Peasants see with sorrow and wounded pride how many doors ignorance closes against them—how many opportunities of bettering their condition are lost for want of knowing how “to read, write, and cypher.” The statistics of crime show that the far greater number of *poor* offenders cannot read. The press teems with cheap and useful works, public houses are comparatively unfrequented, and the advantage of *NOW* facilitating the peasant's approach to useful knowledge cannot be too strongly inculcated. The truly Reverend and revered Mr. Mathew has, under divine blessing, taught the present generation to look with just abhorrence on intemperance. It is the duty of a paternal legislature to supply the place of that illustrious man to the rising generation, and, by education, to lead them into the paths of industry, least they fall into the sin which their parents forsook.

The natural consequences of improvement in the moral condition of any peasantry are, respect for good laws, love of order, desire for comfort, and taste for industry—industry, which is the twin sister of religion, protecting the mind from the snares of idleness, and her handmaid, vice; for true is the Irish proverb, that “an idler's brain is Satan's workshop.” By education is here understood reading, writing, arithmetic, and some simple but general information, particularly the rudiments of agriculture to such as are intended for that pursuit. It is true that a knowledge of reading and writing is not essential to the learning of some trades, but it is essential to stimulate youth to aspire to these trades rather than crowd on each other in a small village. How many Irish and English persons of the upper classes decline to travel solely because they do not know any foreign language? and how reluctant are most persons to admit this deficiency in their education? Can it then be wondered at that an Irish peasant, who is as sensitively alive to ridicule as any man in the highest classes of society, will not leave that home where his ignorance is best concealed, and where he associates only with those labouring under the same deficiencies?

Education of the peasant—a full share of freeman's rights—a representative body elected on sound principles—impartial administration of justice, and good protective laws for all classes—a state outlay at present, to meet the effects of long continued injustice, and a state encouragement to companies and indi-

viduals willing to expend large sums in undertakings of national utility—bounties on the struggling efforts of the poor, as on fisheries, &c. &c.—all these will make Ireland a source of wealth, instead of being a burthen to the empire, and a drain on the public purse. An excuse for keeping up a standing army (that truest evidence of bad government), and agrarian outrage, will disappear with distress, just as the riots in the manufacturing districts in England do. The gentry of Ireland have not the means of atoning for the wholesale fraud and wholesale plunder committed on Ireland by British Governments. The *Times* newspaper calls on the Irish landlords, who are amongst the heaviest sufferers by British misrule, to indemnify the Irish people for the losses—the ruin—which the system of misgovernment that able paper, unhappily for Ireland, countenances, has inflicted and is hourly inflicting on this portion of the Queen's dominions.

The English admirers of the polities supported by the *Times*, which talks of “My money,” and “why should we be taxed for the benefit of the Irish,” will act justly if they recollect that when they apply the term “My money” to public money, thus making it exclusively English—they either declare that they intend to rob Ireland openly or that the Union is repealed; for until that event takes place England is not entitled to talk of her money. “Our money,” as used by the English, is not to refer to England only, “our” must include Ireland; but setting aside the justice and taking the outlay as a mere question of profit, the case of Ireland is quite as strong. A nation as well as a company can work mines at profit, and Ireland will amply repay the empire for developing her resources. These statements are not mere declamation, they are the results of a course of reasoning based on observation of very many facts, and on well-founded assumption with regard to others. Whilst education is advocated, it should be a paramount consideration that physical remedies must be applied to physical distress—that hunger will not be appeased by theory—that two millions three hundred and odd thousand have been declared by the Commissioners of Poor-laws to be paupers, and that feeding is a preliminary to learning; but, alas, bigotry and party spirit will not allow either to be effected without thrusting in their Gorgon Heads, paralizing sound policy and petrifying benevolence. “No national works” (*i. e.* no food) says party spirit, because asking for them would cast an imputation on the justice, the policy, and the humanity of the government we support, such measures not having originated with them. “No education,” says bigotry, unless the party wishing to learn to read shall consent to receive instruction at the sacrifice of a religious scruple.

The pretext for quarrel, the apple of discord is here unhappily the Bible. The most wealthy and powerful, but not the most nu-

merous party, stands at the portal of the Temple of the Muses with a Bible in one hand and a sword in the other. You shall not enter say these gaolers of literature, you shall not learn how to read, unless you consent to make a class-book of this work, about the meaning of which the cleverest men in Europe differed before and ever since printing was invented, and about which they differ still.

If any unprejudiced man will attentively investigate the question, whether the Scriptures are circulated by sectaries of every grade of Protestantism without note or comment, he will perceive that it requires no small portion of political boldness (for religion which is always fair and open has nothing to do with this question) to convert into a “stumbling block of offence” and bar to education, the Catholics’ objection to circulate the Scriptures without note or comment. History mourns whilst she records, the cruelties of the Pagan Bigot, the devastations of the Goth and Vandal, whose career was marked by the wholesale destruction of the works of the learned, but these lamentable demonstrations of the perversity of human intellect sink into insignificance when compared with modern barbarism which, on the pretext of rendering service to God, arrays itself to withhold education from a whole nation unless they shall consent to purchase it by dereliction from religious duty! There is a mixture of the ludicrous with the horrible when we read in the daily press that a class of religionists, after abusing their “Papist” fellow-sinners, and forging fetters for his mind by excluding him from the benefits of education actually chaunts the Doxology !!! Thus did the benighted members of the Inquisition of old. They called themselves Catholic Christians, assumed the attributes of God, and wreaked their bigoted fury on the Jews, His chosen people—sung a *Te Deum* and commanded an *auto da fe*.\*

Is it not foretold in Scripture that there *should* be a variety of opinions on religious subjects? Where is the Scripture warrant for coercion, or for more than advice to induce a man to adopt any particular form of religion? Where in Scripture is to be found more than mild remonstrance, rebuke, and separation, when unheeded?

It is not necessary to trouble the reader with reference to the Old and New Testaments, and to common sense to prove that Scripture requires teaching and expounding. It is quite sufficient for the writer’s purposes to establish a charge of either duplicity, inconsistency, or ignorance of facts against those who arraign the Catholic clergy for refusing to permit the Scripture to be circulated amongst their flocks without note or comment.†

\* Heretic burning in Spain.

† The Catholic clergy and laity circulate, and anxiously desire to circulate, the Scriptures with notes and comments explanatory of their doctrines; and these notes are taken from the works of the earliest, most able, and most pious commentators.

If these be unnecessary appendages to the Scriptures, how comes the Rev. Mr. Doddesley's Bible Expositor to be a standard Protestant work? Why is Scotts' and Henry's edition of the Bible (a work filled with the most copious notes) in universal use amongst Protestants? Why is Bagster's edition\* of the New Testament an edition expressly intended for general use being actually printed in pocket size, and called a pocket edition. Why is this standard, this beautifully got up and lately published Protestant edition of the Scriptures, not merely published with explanatory notes and comments, but with the most gross libels and bitter attacks on the Catholic religion appended in notes?† What terms can characterise the hardihood of men who allow the Catholic only an option between giving to his child editions of Scripture with Protestant notes and rude controversial assaults on his creed, or placing in the hands of infancy the Song of Soloman, or the Revelations, without any explanation whatsoever. But says the gaoler of education you may select some other part of Scripture, provided you consent not to expound it in the school according to the interpretation of your church!!! Let the Papist (as they call him) reply.

“ In the first place, I protest against your right to dictate to me at all; I have just as much right to insist on the Douay version of the Scriptures (which I freely and joyfully circulate,) being used in your schools, (for it is part of *my* discipline, that the Scriptures require explanation, and that they should be published with note and comment,) as you have to insist on the Scriptures being circulated without notes. But how glaring is your injustice and inconsistency, when it can be proved, by going into any booksellers shop, that you only profess to circulate the Scriptures without notes, for it is a part of your practice, that they should be published with them. More than half your editions of the Scriptures are published with notes, but if you sanctioned the issue of but a single edition with notes, you admitted the *principle of their utility, and cannot without flagrant inconsistency, denounce the practice in the case of another.* You are at variance with yourself, you do the very thing for which you condemn me; dare you assert that you do not publish the Scriptures with notes and comments? Can you deny that, you explain and expound the Scriptures to your children, nay, that you hire illiterate men, often traders on your credulity, and send them to the cabins of the Irish peasantry, to expound the Scripture according to your Anti-Catholic views, and will you descend to a subterfuge, and pretend that there is any real difference between impressing your comment by oral instruction, and printing that same comment. Is it not even safer to print it? Would you give the 6th chapter of St. John to your children, and remain

\*The Writer uses this edition from its being so portable when travelling.

†See note to 2 Thess. iii.

*silent?* If you did not station a Protestant sentinel over that chapter, could you hope that the unsophisticated child would call the words of the Redeemer florid metaphorical orientalisms, and join in your protest? Would you not rush with parental solicitude to save him from Popery, or from the Deism consequent on taking the Capharnaumite view, that Christ's assertions were too hard for belief?" Assuredly, you are too honorable, too candid, not to admit that you would not allow your child to take that chapter as the Royal Head of your Church, and the Episcopal Bench command you in the preamble to the thirty-nine articles, to take those rules of your faith, namely, in "their literal and grammatical sense, and according to their plain full meaning," and that you must "not draw them aside in any way"—you are too fervent a lover of truth not to avow that you teach your child your exposition of that, and of other chapters ; and that your exposition is diametrically opposed to the literal and grammatical meaning which the Catholic adopts, and that your interpretation, be it right or wrong, does draw seventeen verses of that chapter aside from their plain meaning, and that to suit your interpretation of one single verse, you call these seventeen verses rhetorical figures, else they flatly contradict your doctrine. Well then, I a Catholic, desire that the exposition of my church be given in a note, so that my child can refer to it when I am not present, and I now repeat, and defy you to deny it, that you orally and in print do just what you impute to me as a crime, because I make the rule absolute. But again, even if I could not prove, as I have done, a charge of inconsistency. I can convict you of injustice, for attempting to interfere between me and my right to a portion of my own money, allocated for general educational purposes, and allocated without any condition being made by the grantors (the parliament), but clogged with conditions, by you, who are merely like myself, not legislators, but recipients of imperial bounty. Some of this money has been wrung from the sweat of my brow, and I demand my fair and unfettered proportion of the advantages to be derived by an outlay for national purposes. You have not the shadow of right to dictate to me in any thing, but less in religious subjects, than in any other matter of importance ; and were it possible, you have less than no right to dictate to me on matters connected with religion. Be content with having appropriated to your clergy the property of mine ; with having seized my churches, and converted them into batteries to assail my creed ; with having for three hundred years proscribed that creed, and hunted down that clergy ; with having manacled me by penal statutes, confiscated my lands, and exiled my forefathers for loyalty to those against whom you rebelled. I can forgive the persecution, I do not mourn over the spoliation ; I cannot recall the exiled chieftain, nor do I seek to avenge my

country's wrongs, I can pray for my oppressors, and I do not revert to those deplorable scenes to stimulate myself to wrath, or to keep up sinful animosity; my religion teaches me to forgive, and oh, for the love of the God of peace, allow me to forget, but hear my unalterable resolve—you shall never lead me to countenance insidious attacks on the doctrines of my religion, or overt ones on the discipline of my Church, I will purchase no temporal benefit at the risk of divine displeasure; you may, by superior and armed force deprive me of the rights of man, but not even to that, were it ten-fold greater, will I yield one iota of what I hold to be my duty to God, and to my Church. You may blight my worldly prospects—my immortal soul you shall not imperil."

Could Protestants respect Catholics who consented that their children should learn religion from *any book* edited in a manner, of which they strongly disapproved, and deficient in that which they held to be an essential concomitant exposition. Let theologians and metaphisicians amuse themselves with this proposition: suppose the Protestant to be the true religion, and the Catholic in error; suppose the Catholic thinks otherwise, but from being what is called an "easy man," and from giving up this little point, and that little point, at last *without real heartfelt conviction*, slides into the Established religion, is his soul in less danger by having professed the true religion, believing it to be false, or by professing the false religion, believing it to be true?\* There is another view of this case.—Is ignorance favourable or unfavourable to Protestantism? Which is most likely to embrace that creed, the ignorant or the educated man? The man who can read, or the man who cannot? The Protestant who places the slightest obstacle to education, (and asking any one to do what his religion forbids, raises a *certain barrier*,) virtually declares that his church's hopes are fixed on conversions amongst the illiterate. Here again, it is respectfully submitted that Pro-

\* For the writer's part, he looks on the Mahomedan who conscientiously adheres to what he believes to be the true mode of worshipping God, as being in a safer position than the Catholic who, without considering it essential to his salvation, becomes a Protestant; or than the Protestant who, without such conviction, becomes a Catholic. It is humbly hoped, that men will be judged according to the light given them, and the writer boldly asserts, that he considers the Mahomedan or Hindoo safer than the proselytizer by trade (whether Catholic or Protestant), who attempts to make some converts by insidious means, and who by falsehoods, by worldly lures, or by intimidation, endeavours to turn a man from the religion he thinks safe, only to lead him reluctantly to one in which he feels no security. An ably conducted Dublin newspaper (the *Mail*) has lately vaunted much of the conversions, to the law-Established Church, which took place amongst certain ancient Irish families. If the editor will reflect on the pains and penalties of professing the Catholic faith in those converting days, and of the lures and rewards for deserting it, he will perhaps revise his list. Penal Laws will convert the weak and worldly, but confirm the bold and truly pious. Let the editor credit the Catholic religion with conversions made from it by terror, for life, limb, and fortune, and he may strike his balance when he pleases.

testant declarations, and Protestant acts are at variance. They ascribe to ignorance the existence of “Popery” in Ireland—and they annex a condition to education which amounts to a veto.

It is certainly good policy to prevent a nation doomed to oppression, from receiving the benefits of education; for it is a dangerous experiment to oppress an educated people—revolution would be their commentary on such a course. Perpetual agitation is but the expedient of a weak\* and somewhat uneducated people. The Parisians (and Parisians settle the affairs of France,) never agitate; yet they arrange matters in cases of oppression, in a manner so consonant with the principles of justice and the rights of mankind, that the crowned heads of Europe, (and lately our own Sovereign,) have complimented them on their spirited conduct, by visiting and congratulating the object of their free choice; though only distinguished by having, like his ancestors, established his hereditary claim to the title of a rebel subject.

Religion is, thanks to Providence, the security for peace in Ireland; and a better one on the part of the people than even the consciousness of present inability to enforce justice. The Irish people perceive that if the contest for a good form of government is to be successful it must be bloodless, and to be valuable at any time it should be so. The advance to the full enjoyment of national rights must be step by step. The coolness and good temper with which the people have carried on their share of the Repeal agitation have raised them in the estimation of their fellow-subjects in England—whose opposition to Repeal will diminish in the exact proportion that their respect for and confidence in the Irish increase. The Repeal road has many stages; the first is extension of the franchise; the second, increase of the representative body; and, without losing sight of a Repeal, these are turnpikes at which, on the journey to domestic government, it will be necessary to take tickets.

There are many difficulties in the way of a settlement of the church question, but none which will not yield to steady perseverance, and to continued, firm, and temperate appeals to Protestant justice and to Protestant reason. Heartfelt conscientiousness in some; timidity, suspicion, habit, pride, parsimony, and prejudice in others—each influencing a sub-division of Protestants—combine to prevent any change in the Established Church temporalities: (be it understood that no term of *reproach* is intended to refer to Protestants as a body) some Protestants think that the dignity of their religion would be impaired unless the Papist not merely recognized but felt the weight of Protestant Ascendancy. The “*Damnable Idolater*,” as the Catholic is called, is required not only to bow down and pay homage, but tribute also. Other

\* “Weak” does not here refer to intellect, but to a deficiency of physical force.

Protestants, long accustomed to command, are too proud to descend to equality. It is a fact so notorious that Protestants are amply rich enough to support their church without any difficulty, that it is unnecessary to go into a charge of parsimony, save by stating this fact. The amount which they compel Catholics to pay to their church is (not to speak of the pressure) more than enough to make the impost vexatious; but were it only a single pound, the impost is repugnant to the principles of justice, and at variance with the rules of consistency: repugnant to justice because no citizen of a free state should be compelled to contribute either directly or indirectly to the support of a creed from which he derives no benefit, and which declares his to be damnable and idolatrous; and at variance with consistency, because the leading dogma of the Protestant religion is the right of private judgment—thus tolerating dissent yet mulcting the Dissenter; at variance also with consistency, because, according to the Protestant code of ecclesiastical law, there is no limitation against the church, in which case the Catholic Church of the olden time might, on precedent, plead exemption from the statute of limitation, and re-enter whenever Catholics were strong enough. The Protestant population of London is nearly as great as the Protestant population of all Ireland. What would the London Protestant population say if they were asked to pay for the following church establishment:—

2 Archbishops,	52 Vicars Choral,
22 Bishops,	20 Choristers,
33 Deaneries,	12 Choir Readers and Stipendiaries,
26 Precentorships,	30 Diocesan Schools,
22 Chancellorships,	175 Officers in Consistorial Courts,
22 Treasurerships,	749 Benefices, single parishes,
34 Archdeaconries,	1781 Parishes compressed into 517 Benefices,
2 Provostships,	Total of offices enjoyed by the Established Clergy, <b>3195.</b>
188 Prebends and Canonries,	
107 Rural Deans,	

In India, the British government has a hundred millions under its jurisdiction, who may, in fact, be called subjects of England, and about whose idolatry there can be no manner of doubt, and yet she does not tax them for the support of one Protestant person. Is there not still less excuse for taxing an Irish subject, whom Government not merely says but *swears* is an idolater? What possible answer is there to this question but a reference to the Horse Guards? Is not the course pursued to the Irish (so sworn) idolater, far more harsh than that pursued to the Hindoo? The British Government have not attempted by penal enactments, including transportation, fine, imprisonment, nay death,\* to suppress their religion; they have respected the Hindoo idolatry; they have not confiscated Hindoo funds and seized on

\* All this was done to Catholics.—See all unprejudiced histories, and any authentic copy of the Penal Statutes.

Hindoo temples for their own clergy. No, no, this plan of acting is reserved solely for their Irish sister. What provision is made for the spiritual comfort of the many thousand British Protestants in India, scattered over an immense empire—both civilians and soldiery? For thousands of miles there is not either church or clergyman, a state of things which the writer considers is deplorable. He would wish to see the spiritual wants of his fellow-subjects attended to as far as it was possible; but piety becomes very questionable whenever it trenches on justice. We may not “do evil that good may result.” There is not a Protestant in the empire who would not protest against a tax being levied on the Hindoos or Mahomedans for the support of a Protestant clergy—and why Protestants uphold the principle that a Catholic fellow-Christian should be compelled to pay a Protestant clergy, is a problem which cannot be solved by the ordinary rules of equity.

The inferences which the writer desires to draw from these facts are—first, that Protestants who go to India must take care of their own souls; but, if they go to Ireland, they will be taken care of for them by the government, at the expense of Irish Catholics. Secondly, that a Protestant Government entertains less anxiety about Protestant souls when they are 4,000 miles off than when they are near home; and thirdly, that it is a more pious, praiseworthy undertaking (and clearly a safer one), to burden and to institute a crusade against seven millions of Papists than to experimentalize on one hundred millions of Pagans.

The writer has no hesitation in saying that if the Protestants of Ireland were too poor to support a sufficient number of clergymen, he believes that they would be assisted by all Catholics who were sufficiently affluent,\* and most assuredly he would contribute as far as his means allowed; but no such plea as poverty could be made—for it was asserted by the late Lord Liverpool, and by Doctor Duignan, that nineteen-twentieths of the property of Ireland was in Protestant hands. In treating of this question it is earnestly hoped that no expression has been made use of which could offend any pious Protestant. There is no atonement which the writer would in such a case hesitate to make; as nothing can be farther from his thoughts or wishes. He would never con-

\* The existence of this feeling is illustrated by reference to a recent occurrence. The Rev. Mr. Nevin, a respected Protestant curate, of advanced age, and acting for a long series of years in Dublin, but not adequately remunerated for his services, was, by a legal decision, rendered unable to enforce the greater portion of his salary—the rate from which he had derived it not being based in law. Whilst a Protestant parishioner was his chief opponent, we find that a Catholic parishioner (Mr. Duffy, the publisher of this work,) proposed and was supported by all the Catholics present, that the rate should be continued for the maintenance of this clergyman. The resolution was carried, and the Rev. Gentleman is indebted to Catholics (who have taxed themselves) for his moderate income. This is the voluntary principle practically illustrated; and it is a happiness to record such instances of its value. The majority of men of all creeds was for supporting a *worthy* Clergyman.

sent that a single Protestant clergyman now existing should be deprived of one shilling of his income. Any arrangement should provide for the present incumbents, bishops, and others for their lives; but as to future appointments, it is an opinion entertained by many of the sincerest friends to Protestantism that, without pressing on Protestants of any class more than they could bear with perfect convenience, an ample and more equal provision could be made for their clergy, without taxing Catholics for that purpose; and the religion itself would be more respectable and respected. Catholics are not above one-twentieth as rich, and they have not merely not solicited but peremptorily refused to allow a Protestant to contribute a single farthing to the support of a Catholic clergyman. The opinions of a Protestant Lord Chancellor, keeper of the conscience of a Protestant Monarch, are here respectfully submitted to the readers, not with a view of presuming to suggest, as the noble Lord did, that the Episcopal Bench might be dispensed with—for the writer is not of that opinion—but merely to show the wide difference which exists between Protestant christianity, as supported in Scotland, and Protestant christianity, as maintained in Ireland, a Catholic country:

“Strange as it may seem,” says Lord Brougham, in one of his eloquent harangues, “and to many who hear me incredible, from one end of the kingdom [Scotland] to the other, a traveller will see no such thing as a bishop—not such a thing is to be found from the Tweed to John o’Groats: not a mitre; no nor so much as a minor canon, or even a rural dean—and in all the land not a single curate—so entirely rude and barbarous are they in Scotland—in such utter darkness do they sit that they support no cathedrals, maintain no pluralists, suffer no non-residence; nay, the poor benighted creatures are ignorant even of tithes! Not a sheaf, or a lamb, or a pig, or the value of a plough-penny, do the hopeless mortals render from year’s end to year’s end! Piteous as their lot is, what makes it infinitely more touching is to witness the return of good for evil, in the demeanour of this wretched race. Under all this cruel neglect of their spiritual concerns, they are actually the most loyal, contented, moral, and religious people any where, perhaps, to be found in the world.”—*Trial of John Ambrose Williams, for a libel on the Clergy of Durham, August 16th, 1822*, p. 43.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

### UNRECLAIMED LAND—GOVERNMENT WORKS—REMEDY FOR ABSENTEEISM.

There are nearly three millions\* of acres of waste land in Ireland; of this about three-fourths could be converted to agricultural purposes by draining, &c. There are two millions three hundred thousand paupers in this country, and about seven hundred thousand very distressed persons in the working classes, not

\* See reports of Commissioners, in 1809; Nimmo’s Reports, &c.

absolutely paupers : of these three millions, there are about eight hundred thousand men who would think themselves fortunate to obtain wages at the rate of ten pence per day, though having families to support, eight pence being about the average rate of labourers' wages in Ireland. If to the ten pence a-day to the father of a family, ten pence a-day more were added for the labour of his wife, and child of 12 or 13 years' old, that peasant would consider himself well off, in Ireland, where whole families in some places subsist on sixpence a-day. Leases for 21 years, at rents varying from 1s. to 2s. 6d. an acre, would be joyfully given by the proprietors of unreclaimed land to the government ; and the government could, as a preliminary, fix a maximum rent to be demanded at the expiration of the term, thus preventing these lands from being over let then. Irish moor-land moderately drained, will, by merely burning the top sod and using it as manure, produce good potatoes on the first year of taking it in hands, and on the second, excellent oats. Cutting the drains gives fuel to the cultivators, by drying the turf thrown up, having cut it with a slane (a tool to shape it into masses the size of bricks). The profit on this land, let for so long a term, at a mere nominal rent of a shilling or two per acre, would be enormous long ere the 21 years had elapsed. The employment given would not merely be of use to those occupied in such public works, but would raise the rate of wages every where without injury to employers of any, particularly of the landlord class ; for their rents would be better paid, and their lands would be better cultivated. A crowded population with very small holdings exhaust land ; they never can fallow it, never can have a proper succession of crops. Employment, too, would cause poor-rates to disappear, for the Irish people are not amateur inmates of poor-houses ; every class would be benefitted ; the revenue would increase in proportion, and what would be a great desideratum to government, political opinions would be advocated with a degree of coolness which could not be called agitation—for a busied population does not agitate ; it petitions, and what it loses in declamation it gains in weight. If government were once to set on foot public works, companies and private capitalists would soon follow the example, and turn their thoughts to Ireland instead of to the Rouen Railway, South America, &c. &c. It is idle to raise objections to this plan on the pretext that governments should not become traders and traffickers with the public property. Government would work a silver mine\* with it; yes, and take the mine by force,

\*Those who prefer being witty to being wise, who like sarcasm better than argument, and ridicule more than reasoning, will scoff at the idea of Irish moor-land being spoken of in the same page with a silver mine. For one man that lost money by reclaiming land, one hundred have been injured by mining. Laying out money on a mine is an uncertain speculation, and at most a temporary gain ; expending it on moor-land ensures a certain and permanent return ; the process is simple, labour cheap, and outlay comparatively small.

too, in the Queen's name ; so that the only question is one of amount of profit ; and as there could not by possibility be any loss in this case—nay, a certain gain would result—and as justice, humanity, and good policy are all enlisted in behalf of the proposition, perhaps these united facts may be weighed against the superior profit of working a silver mine. There can be no objection raised on the score that governments do not farm and collect rents. The Irish know to their cost that governments do collect rents ; for instance, the quit and crown rents amounting to a large revenue, which they carry off to England ; and governments do farm and graze cattle, as the Commissioners of the Woods and Forests can testify.

The government could raise 50 millions for public works in Ireland (remember the twenty millions *sunk* on the negroes), and the reduction of part of the useless army, together with the increase of the revenue, growing out of the increased prosperity of a nation, would more than pay the interest at three per cent.

The people of England are injured by the language held, and the course pursued by Government towards this country, they are misled in supposing Ireland to be on the verge of rebellion, and they send their capital to other countries, to France,\* where with as much truth as wit, a list of amusements for the week, contained the following announcement, "*aujourd' hui polichinelle demain fen d'artifice, après demain—revolution.*" Government partizans allege, that it is the language of Mr. O'Connell, and of a few others, which has kept English capital from Ireland. If these gentlemen even did say that the people were ripe for rebellion, the government ought not to have believed them—for it would have been a gross misstatement ; and the Cabinet ought to have known the state of a country under its jurisdiction better, than to have for a moment credited the report : but they had not that pretext, for Mr. O'Connell did not make such an assertion. In moments of excitement, Mr. O'Connell did not draw a proper distinction between an oligarchy† in England, and her people, but this is an error easily atoned for ; it was one of the lip, not of the heart. Had Mr. O'Connell reflected at the moment, his knowledge of human nature would have pointed out the error of confounding a nation with a government. The people of both nations have many thoughts, wants, complaints, wishes, and feelings in common : between a poor man in England, France, America, and Ireland, there cannot be a very wide difference in opinion—and certainly no instinctive

\* It is to be deplored that this illustrious People, who know so well how to achieve freedom, have never learned the art of preserving it. They forge fetters to day to break them to-morrow.

† The writer has published several small works, in all of which he entreated politicians to draw a marked line between an oligarchy and a people.

feelings of mutual distrust or dislike. Mr. O'Connell is a kind-hearted, peace-loving man, and when ever he is sure that the olive branch will be accepted, no man will be more ready to present it to the people of England. In concluding remarks on the necessity of setting on foot public works, it is essential to observe, that Government would, by means of wise and paternal measures, be henceforward regarded as the dispensers of justice, and benefactors to a nation—instead of being known only as vessels of wrath, or lictors with the scourge.

There have been various measures proposed to remedy the evils attendant on Absenteeism. Some persons, conspicuous in the political world, have suggested a tax on Absentee Proprietors; this would inflict a wrong on one party without effectually redressing the grievance of the other. The following proposition is, no doubt, a novel and startling one, but the owner of the property intended to be dealt with would suffer less by it than by any other mode of dealing with an Absentee Proprietor. Instead of being obliged to pay a heavy tax—and to be at all useful, it should be heavy—he would only be required to make a choice between two countries for his permanent residence; receiving the full value for his property in the other. It cannot be denied that there is a great interference with private rights involved in imposing any condition whatsoever on an Absentee Proprietor of land in Ireland; but desperate cases require desperate remedies—and private property is in many cases interfered with for the public good, where the necessity is not half so urgent, and the advantage to the public infinitely less. Let us suppose the absentee system a general one—would it not be a system, if not of wholesale robbery, certainly carrying with it the utter ruin of a whole people. If it be then ruinous and unjust in principle when carried out to the extent of forty millions, it is ruinous and unjust when carried out to the extent of four millions in the exact proportion which four bears to forty; and a check should be put to it even at the expense of depriving some gentlemen of indulgence in a taste for variety—loss, there should be none to them.

If power were given to Government to purchase at the highest rate of value the estates of absentees, there is little doubt that all of them who are men of feeling, and possessed of a strong sense of justice, would avail themselves of an opportunity to serve their fellow-creatures without any loss to themselves. But such is the calamitous condition of Ireland that it justifies extreme measures; and, if the appeal to equity and humanity failed, it might be prudent, in order to close the ruinous absentee drain, to introduce into parliament a bill to render compulsory the sale of the estates of such absentee proprietors as had also estates in England, and resided there. A Member of Parliament who is returned for two places must make his election; he will not be allowed to

pretend that he can do justice to both. When Government rewards a military man for long service and risk of life, a piece of land in Canada is given to him; but though this is covered with useless trees which must be got rid of at heavy expense; and though going out, and above all, residing there will put the officer to the greatest inconvenience, still he must go, and *must reside*. *No absenteeism will be tolerated*—but to be sure this is to serve our dear colony—our belligerent colony, that took a recipé from her neighbour in the United States,\* to cure an internal disease.†

An act of parliament would get rid of technical difficulties in the title of the estates thus sold, and they could be disposed of in lots of from £25 to £100, annual value. This would create a yeomanry,‡ a class Ireland stands in need of. By granting perpetuities to purchasers, they would become proprietors and employers—not middle-men; subletting on a large scale would be guarded against, and tillage ensured in a far greater proportion than grazing, which is seldom adopted as a sole pursuit by persons who have small holdings.

When it is recollected that absentees are generally persons possessing from £10,000 to £100,000 a-year, and upwards, it will not be considered a great hardship that they should be obliged to dispose, at the highest value, of those Irish properties which they scarcely ever see.

The bill could be so shaped as to affect only those who had properties to a certain large amount in each kingdom. If the principle be once admitted, the whole affair could be arranged with perfect ease, little opposition, and without just cause for any discontent.

It may be objected that the compulsory law would be an invasion of private rights; so was the Slave Bill—so are railroads—so is every improvement in the streets of London. There would be fifty times a greater advantage to the community by selling the estate of an absentee, than by throwing down a man's house in order to beautify a street in London; and great as is the comfort of shortening time in travelling, there is as much right to sell the estate of an absentee for the public good, as to destroy a man's garden and lawn, and annihilate his domestic comforts, by running a railroad close to his door, in order that people should get to a particular place in fewer hours. If the Government fancy any particular spot for the public service, they will instantly take

\* No nation so gallantly won, so carefully preserved, and (Switzerland excepted) so little abused unbounded liberty as America did.

† When the British Government saw the *striking* effects of the first dose, they immediately evinced the utmost solicitude for the patient, and placed her under *home parliamentary treatment*, which was just what she wanted.

‡ The Irish readers should be apprised, that yeomanry is the term in England applied to farmers whom in Ireland we should call snug farmers.

it, compelling the owner to give it up\* at a valuation. It is a notorious fact that the establishment of the free trade principle beggared and drove out of employment many hundred thousand persons. Who talked of private properties then—or even of the livelihood of whole towns and districts?—and yet in these cases there was absolute ruin, and no compensation; and in the absentees' case, individuals already enormously rich would be amply repaid, and could concentrate their properties elsewhere. Many absentees are most excellent landlords,† and have highly esteemed gentlemen as agents; but nothing can compensate for non-residence *on a great scale*—and nothing could so much benefit Ireland as the creation of a class of small proprietors. The Government should secure to the owner of the property to be sold, a price, after the fullest investigation, declared to be its *utmost possible value*; and the Government would in no case lose—for there is a great deal of small detached capital in Ireland, and by selling in small lots to be within reach of that, and by ensuring safe titles, and giving perpetuities, there would be competition at the very highest rate of purchase. But even supposing there were a loss, and that the Imperial Treasury gave more for an estate sold wholesale than it afterwards brought at retail price (a supposition contrary to every commercial principle), still, when a great national benefit is to be obtained, a small imperial loss should not be a barrier; time would assuredly bring about remuneration.

Interference with private rights for public good is a maxim recognized in all ages. Even the price of commodities has been regulated on that principle. From the time of Henry VII. to James I. the statutes and parliamentary history will show that the legislature frequently regulated the affairs of landlord and tenant, and restricted tillage land from being on too extensive a scale converted into pasture. Lord Bacon,‡ Sir J. Fortescue, and other eminent men in those periods, brought forward motions on these subjects. The 25th of Henry VIII. enacted that farmers should not keep above 2000 sheep, and should not occupy two farms; and this was extending the principle applied by the 4th of Henry VII. to the Isle of Wight. Perhaps it may be useful to give a summary of those acts;§ the object in doing so is merely

\* The writer has some experience in these matters. In his father's life-time the Government seized on a piece of ground in his demesne, not far from the house, and built on it a martello tower; quartered soldiers in it, cut up the lawn, and damaged the place, and annoyed the proprietor in every possible way—but never gave a penny compensation. The writer himself was compelled to sell an island belonging to him—in order to have a lighthouse erected on it—which he did for its mere value.

† At the head of the list of actively humane and enlightened landlords is the writer's valued friend, George Lane Fox, of Bramham Park, Yorkshire, Esq., M.P., who to ancient lineage, princely fortune, and mental endowments, unites that practical benevolence which illustrates Christianity and adorns man.

‡ Parl. Hist. vol. iv. p. 414.

§ See Appendix.

to show that the Legislature considered interference with the disposal and culture of land as a right vested in it, and the exercise of that right an imperative duty.

The mode here suggested of dealing with absentee estates would largely contribute to prevent some of the evil consequences of the entail principle and the rights of primogeniture—which might more justly be termed, the wrongs of younger children.\*

A statute of Edward I. established the entail principle, in order to create a rich oligarchy, and established it with such rigour that a relaxation became necessary in the reign of Edward IV., when the previous act was, however, rather eluded than repealed.

The 4th of Henry VII. took a more extended view, for he was jealous of the nobility, and was of suspicious temper. Breaking entails, levying fines, and suffering recoveries, powers of raising money, &c. &c., were found to be essential to *national prosperity* as well as to the ends of abstract justice. The privilege to alienate estates was first given by Henry VII. to persons who had served in the army.

Most of the estates in Ireland are heavily mortgaged; and it would not only be prudent to make the sales of absentees' estates compulsory, but to frame enactments to facilitate the sale of all estates,† by getting rid of obsolete charges, and by diminishing the price of stamps and regulating at low rates all law charges in these cases. A number of estates would be brought into the market, and would pass into the hands of capitalists, who alone can improve them, instead of being in the hands of needy men or of chancery receivers. The advantage of this to the nation would be incalculable. The tenantry would be greatly benefitted, as the tenantry of distressed landlords generally partake of his distress; and the distressed portion of the proprietary would get a better price and readier sale, and would no longer be acting as many of them are—as the unpaid agents of the most useless class‡ (speaking generally) in the community—the mortgagees; who never contribute a fraction to the improvement of the land (their security), or to alleviate the distress of a tenantry from whom they often derive a larger income than the less fortunate landlord. This class is not affected by any fluctuation. The creditors of the nation are subject to fluctuation in interest, but the mortgagee creditor must have his pound of flesh—his six per cent.—and though famine desolated the locality from which it was drawn, the writer can vouch that not one farthing was contributed by a mortgagee proprietary, deriving between thirty and forty thousand pounds a year from districts in this calamitous situation. Were Ireland under the government of men who would turn their

\* The writer does not speak selfishly—he was the eldest son.

† The bill of the Right Hon. G. O. Moore, M.P. for Dublin, was very useful on this point, but might now be much improved and extended in its operations.

‡ This observation refers to mortgagees receiving high rate of interest.

whole thoughts to develope, and to help her to develope her resources, they would find able and willing coadjutors in the capitalists of England; and in a few years the terms Saxon and Celt would be forgotten, The British people would, when they knew Ireland by personal observation, and when the properties of thousands of them were embarked in business here, join the Irish in a calm representation, that it was for the interest of England and Ireland that each nation should transact its own domestic business; whilst the happiness and the honour of the empire would be the joint care and cherished object of both.

---

### CHAPTER XIII.

**GOVERNMENT CHOICE—ADVANCE OR FALL BACK—MARTIAL LAW—POPULAR LEADERS—BEWARE—'82—FOREIGN FRIENDSHIPS—LIMITED LOYALTY—LOUIS PHILIPPE—LOYALTY *per se*.**

Two causes, and but two, remain open to Government—they must either recede or advance, they cannot remain stationary, they cannot venture to assert that matters shall or could remain as they now are—that is utterly impossible. There is not an adult in the empire who does not perceive that if they advance on the principle they commenced with, they must advance at the head of the army they have assembled; and their next steps must be martial law, suspension of the *Habeas Corpus* Act, gagging bills, &c. &c. The line of imprudent march, commencing with proclamations and prosecutions for *conspiracy*, has been plainly pointed out; but it is to be hoped that in the ensuing royal speech,\* grievances, before said to be ideal, will be spoken of as real, and a pledge then be given to have them inquired into. Thus will Ministers have made a retrograde movement on the sure position where religion, justice, humanity, and prudence will point out the remaining course. How infinitely preferable will this be to rushing on in the wild hope that the people will be intimidated, or forsake their present leaders, and adopt such as government might select for them! And for whom would the people forsake those *tried* friends? Would they select as leaders, in a struggle to obtain redress of grievances, any one man who by his vote in parliament plainly told them that they had no grievances to be redressed? Would they select Tories, so many of whom are their notorious opponents?—or Whigs, so many of whom are their *pseudo* friends? Or would they expect to find a male leader amongst those emasculated gentry who call themselves neutrals, and declare that polities are too much for their nerves, tremble at the thought of a public meeting, shrink sensitively from the idea of avowing that they entertain any opinion, and “die of a rose in aromatic pain.”

\* This was written before the Royal Speech was published.

Constitutional Ministers will strengthen their Government at home in preference to propping it up by compliments to foreign powers, who may not always be in the mood to forget the olden time of deadly strife. Livy wisely warned posterity when he said, “*Civitas ea autem in libertate sit posita quæ suis stat viribus non ex alieno arbitrio pendet.*”\*

One friendly, nay just act, would bind Ireland more firmly to Great Britain than a show off of influence with every king in Europe. Idle displays and declarations are seen through by the shallowest politicians. *Twelve months of good government would place the integrity of this empire on a surer foundation than a century wasted in complimenting foreigners*, some of whom detest England with a mortal aversion, as every man in Europe but an Englishman knows, if he lived in those countries one year. What a combination of ignorance of human nature and of vanity it is for the *victrix* of a hundred fights by sea and land, to fancy herself beloved by her conquered rival!

No man should undertake to say exactly how much loyalty the Irish people possess—but there can be no doubt that it was four times the amount of their patriotism, until last year—when the latter marched a couple of steps. In the year 1782, there were strong indications of patriotic feeling amongst some of the aristocracy, but very little evidence of that feeling amongst the people, or we should not be under the necessity of now agitating for a Repeal, as there would have been no parliamentary union. The northern Protestants were, indeed, gloriously active, for the natural reason, that they had the feelings of freemen; but the Catholics were so debased by slavery, so hopeless of freedom, that they took a comparatively slight interest in the great struggle of 1782. The banner of that period was a libel on civilization and Christianity; Liberty was on one side of it, and bigotry on the other; a Catholic enlisting under it, would be the slave dancing the fetter-hornpipe.

With a few exceptions, the Patriots† (so called, of that day) are now egregiously overrated. They strutted about in their fancy uniforms, shouting “free trade for Ireland,” and then, *sotto voce*, “Chain up the Papists;” constitutional rights for Hibernia—manacle, and deprive of them, every man who makes the sign of the cross and says Hail Mary. After the shocking specimen Irish parliaments afforded of an Irish aristocracy, one does not know which to admire most—the bold confidence of the people who would now try them again, or the modest diffidence of the aristocracy, lest they should wander—*haud passibus equis*—into the paths of their progenitors.

\* That state alone is free which rests on its own strength, and does not depend on the arbitrary will of another.

† Most of these gentlemen were opposed to Catholic Emancipation.

There are two classes in Ireland in the present day who state that they have a large stock of loyalty and patriotism. It is to be hoped that both are sincere. They have, however, very different ways of showing their sincerity, and they differ as much in constitutional temperament as in mode of action. One party may be very willing to see good measures pursued towards Ireland, but it is too courteous to think of intruding such trifles on the British Government; it is too long accustomed to bend before all governments, and too indolent to make the slightest exertion for the public good. It is very anxious for calm, but totally indifferent to the mode of procuring it, and to its duration—nay, quite ready to establish a temporary calm at the expense of a battle or two! This party is very brave, but rather nervous. Brave, yet nervous, is a seeming contradiction. The observation, however, conveys no imputation on courage; no man will question the courage of any class of Irishmen—but all men are nervous who shout for aid before there is any real danger, and draw swords before any antagonist has appeared.

The second class participates in the wish of the first for good measures, but not in its inertness. It toils to obtain a consummation of the mutual desire; it values courtesy, but cannot consent to let ministers, who are only highly paid public servants, continue to sleep and neglect their duty. It is the equal of the first in courage, and its superior in coolness, activity, and prudence. It is fully as desirous of calm, but wishes to insure its perpetuity, and protests against the suppression of public opinion by force of arms being mistaken for established tranquillity. This party is the people—the other, the aristocracy.

Now the people would like ease and comfort just as much as the aristocracy (if it were only for the novelty of the thing); but they are not selfish, they cannot consent to accept them unless on terms that will ensure their transmission to posterity. When not goaded to desperation the People yield not to any class in love of order and in obedience to law. In point of loyalty they far transcend every other class; they never bask in the sunshine of royalty—never even see it—never participate in one of its favours—yet they have spilled their blood to uphold that system of government; and even, at this moment, they look into futurity and, not knowing whether the next generation might be as patient and well-disposed as this is, desire to secure to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, as well as to his Royal Parent, a reign of uninterrupted peace. This can be insured only by now settling the long outstanding account with Ireland; interest and compound interest accumulating much longer will render it impossible for England to pay the debt. It is safer to settle now than to entail the settlement on the Prince of Wales.

There is a view of the political horizon which, by some unfore-

seen possibility, might be realized during the present reign—or perhaps not until the next or some succeeding one. Wisdom thinks for the future as well as the present; cunning only postpones difficulties, never annihilates them. It is by no means impossible that the following serious matters might, *at the same time*, require the attention of Great Britain. There is a strong republican party in France, and the probability of a long minority: in one word, suppose friendly relations with France interrupted—the boundary question with America is not, it is to be feared, fully arranged; Canada is unsettled; and frozen Russia has more than once evinced a desire to thaw in the sultry embrace of India. It would savour of menace, and be an ungracious way of putting the case, to say “if Ireland were then to decide on separation.” But suppose, on the contrary, that Irish loyalty is provocation-proof, and beyond the influence of any grievance, *will that secure* Great Britain from *foreign aggression*? Certainly not. The foreigner will judge by the facts that the British Government has declared sedition to be spread throughout Ireland, and has sent forty thousand soldiers to check it. The foreigner will argue that England dare not remove these troops: the foreigner will, in every negotiation, hold out for conditions injurious to the honour and to the interests of Great Britain. War would be the certain result of this; and though it is to be hoped that the foreigner would soon perceive his error in supposing Ireland revengeful, yet England, involved in war, would too late discover the destructive policy of having governed half an empire in such a manner that Europe and America could assume, either that they would find allies there, or, that if loyalty did exist, it was an abstracted, isolated principle—unsustained by affection and unstrengthened by any community of interest! It casts no stigma on Ireland’s loyalty to desire to see it fortified by such feelings.

The King of the French is shrewd—the French themselves quick-sighted. It cannot be supposed that they have not seen through every step taken in this Empire during the past year, and have not drawn the just inference from each. Here is an open, and here is the power, *currente calamo*, to say many too true and bitter things. It is impossible to take a review of the events of the past year without appearing to be drawing up an indictment against the Government. Simple comments become sarcasms, and truisms severity; but the writer’s object is to reason, not offend—to expostulate, not menace—to speak of the future, and, if possible, forget the past—to allay, not to irritate—to lend his humble but zealous co-operation to unite and bind together—not sunder the hearts of fellow-subjects in both kingdoms.

British Ministers owe a debt of retributive justice to their Sovereign as well as to Ireland. They have, by a series of impolitic acts, proclaimed to Europe that they consider the British

Empire has been for some time and is insecure, and that a large army must be maintained in it. Ireland arraigns them for misrepresentation both with reference to the past and to the present; but she cannot prevent them from labouring to fulfil their own predictions as to the future.

## CHAPTER XIV.

REAL UNION—IRISH CONNEXIONS WITH ENGLAND—ARISTOCRACY VERSUS SEVEN MILLIONS—FRANKNESS—TREACHERY—THERE IS YET TIME, BUT NONE TO SPARE.

A CONSIDERABLE number of Irishmen can, with great truth say—“England, with all thy faults, we love thee still.”\* Faults in governing, are the faults of an oligarchy—not of a whole people. Both nations should recollect the countless intermarriages which have taken place, the hundreds of thousands who have exchanged countries, Englishmen settling here, Irishmen in England. Were a civil war to take place—were English soldiers to discharge a volley in any of the streets of the great towns of Ireland, they would probably draw their own English blood, and were Irish guns to play on any city in England, each volley there would strike an Irishman to the ground. Why not recognize these ties of kindred, why not extend them into a national alliance, and affix the seal of justice to the bond of peace?

Had his Majesty of France affected ignorance, and enquired of the ministers who paid him a complimentary visit, “was the British Empire in a tranquil and happy state?” What would have been their reply? Had he asked them, “what sort of a country Ireland was,” how would they have answered, who never saw the second nation in the empire they ruled? It is fair, for the sake of argument, to profess to credit the assertion of ministers, and to suppose a disaffection—the existence of which has been disputed by all popular leaders. It is fair too, on the part of *alarmed* loyalists, to adopt the ministerial assumption, but not to stop there. If ministers have a right to wander into the regions of conjecture, others may follow; fancy is all fools’ paradise; so, having fancied Ireland seditious—and being quite sure she is discontented—the writer will proceed with the vision of the minister. All men who know France, know that the republican party is very powerful there, that the king is very old, the heir a child, the minority likely to be long, and the French “*tant soit peu volage.*” Let a change come over the spirit of our dream,

\* The writer, once the representative in parliament of nearly 40,000 Englishmen, with sincere gratitude to them, desires to be enrolled in this class.

and France be again a Republic: we will then wing our way to the land of liberty, to brave, generous, but touchy America, and fancy her ruffled on the boundary question. Canada echoing her neighbour's growl, Russia picking German quarrels with all intermediate states, and creeping on from Circassia towards British India, the malcontents in England carrying their demands beyond their present just limits. For the sake of argument, let ministers be supposed to continue to indulge in the *ERRONEOUS* opinion, that Ireland is not forgiving, is not warm of heart, had abandoned those sentiments of loyalty to the crown of Great Britain, which she spilled her best blood, and ruined the properties of her bravest and noblest sons to uphold. Let ministers imagine the former *probabilities* and the latter *possibilities* all come to pass—these visions all embodied, *and then ask themselves* would they not wish some things undone that they have been doing, and that others which they did not do, had been done; *if so, is it too much to call on them to act now precisely as they would then act, and wish they had acted?* Ireland can expect, can desire no more than this.

Rulers of this empire, away with the wily maxim, “Divide and Command,” adopt the sound principle that “Union is Strength;” do not pit a scanty Aristocracy against a nation, and a small section of sectarian worshippers of the God of Peace, against seven millions of their fellow-Christians; try the effect of wholesale, not paltry retail justice; some amongst you have **BOLD**, and it is to be hoped upright minds, **DARE THEN TO BE JUST**, and resign the interested support and applause of a party for the attachment of a kingdom and the respect of Europe; evince more confidence in the people of Ireland than in the contents of your arsenal at Woolwich; unfurl the white, not the blood-red flag; raise the olive branch, and sheathe your sabres.—*Carpe diem*—it is not yet too late—be above the littleness of fearing to be reproached with having done justice “under *duresse*—by compulsion” (*those are the words of your own Press*); blush rather for the long line of your predecessors who have delayed justice until it became retributive and assumed the garb of expediency; do not continue to teach the Irish people to believe that you expect rebellion, for, as they have in the most explicit terms, written and verbal, declared their wish for peace, it looks like a consciousness of great culpability on your part as to the past, or of an intention of future wrong, to make formal preparations to meet an *unthreatened aggression*. Ireland’s patience is *not yet quite exhausted*. Whatever danger there may be in continuing to trifle with it, up to this hour it endures; opposing unshaken loyalty to a deep sense of oppression, and gratitude for instances of sympathetic benevolence (when famine appeared in Ireland), to the dangerous influence of present provocation.

Ministers, the people of Ireland are too just to lay at your door the faults of any of your predecessors; and if you have the moral courage to administer justice in 1844 *with the magnanimity* you did in 1829, you will find that the electric spark of sisterly affection towards your country is not extinct in Ireland. But be assured that your frigates, your steamers, and artillery *are non-conductors*.

It is in your power to rescue the character of two noble nations from the scorn of the civilized world. On Ireland rests the infamy of having fraudulently sold her Constitution—on England, the disgrace of having surreptitiously purchased it. By one great act let both kingdoms obliterate the double stain, and sink into eternal oblivion all recollection of mutual depravity.

The choice of good and evil is yet before you, and no threat of the inevitable penalty on perseverance in error shall fall from the pen of a friend to peace; so far from using the language of menace, it is grateful to the best feelings of every Irishman to deny, on part of his countrymen, all idea of present violence or future treachery. Their acts will ever be open, temperate, manly, and cool. Rulers of the empire, act with justice to them, and you shall not have to say, *incedimus per ignes suppositos cinere doloso.* All that Repealers do will be done openly; they will not, by dissolving their present union until justice has been administered to Ireland, lead you to believe that the people will be satisfied with anything short of it. Seven millions of human beings forbid the demand for more—or the acceptance of less.

\* *Incedimus per ignes suppositos cinere doloso.*

“We walk on fires hidden by deceitful ashes.

THE END.

ALLUSION has been made in this pamphlet to the Reform Bill. The writer takes leave to state that he has always upheld the necessity of extensive reforms—and many of the Tory party (and to that section of it the writer belonged) were favourable to reforms.

In 1829 he was requested by his respected friend, the present Duke of Marlborough (then Marquis of Blandford), to second his Grace's motion for a measure to prevent the sale of seats in Parliament. The Duke's speech was most able; and the writer, with justifiable pride, refers to his having been selected by such a man to second such a motion. In seconding it, he had the honour of addressing the House at considerable length; and, being one of the tellers, can state who did and who did not vote when the division took place. Lord John Russell did not vote; Sir J. C. Hobhouse, with an inconsistency not rare in his political life, spoke one way and voted the other; Lord Brougham supported the motion with his usual talent; many of the leading Whigs absented themselves; Sir R. Peel met the motion by the direct negative, though it merely affirmed a fact, namely, that seats were bought and sold, and that such a practice was unconstitutional and ought to be prevented.

## APPENDIX.

THE most remarkable statute relative to husbandry was enacted under the reign of Henry the Seventh, obliging the owner of every house, that then was, or within three years last past had been, or hereafter should be, let to farm with twenty acres of land or more lying in tillage, to keep and maintain houses and buildings on the said lands necessary for maintaining the said tillage, under a penalty, that the King or lord of the fee should yearly receive a moiety of the profits of the lands, wherever the houses or buildings were not so maintained.\* In the following reign it was ordained, that whosoever should convert tillage lands into pasture, should forfeit a moiety of the profits of the lands to the lord of the fee; and, if he neglected to receive it within one year, it should become the property of the crown till converted into tillage again.† In the time of Edward the Sixth it was enjoined, with some exceptions, that so much land should be put to tillage as was at any time in tillage, and so kept for four years, from the first of Henry the Eighth, under the penalty of forfeiting five shillings an acre.‡ Under the reign of Philip and Mary the act of Henry the Seventh was confirmed, and commissioners were appointed to inquire what defaults or offences had been committed against it since the twentieth of Henry the Eighth.§ In the next reign the foregoing statutes of Edward the Sixth and Philip and Mary were repealed; and the statutes of Henry the Seventh and Eighth were revived, under the penalty of forfeiting ten shillings for every acre converted from tillage into pasture.|| Afterwards it was ordained that lands in tillage should not be converted into pasture, and that all such lands as had been converted into pasture since the first of Elizabeth should be again converted into tillage.¶

The statute of Henry the Seventh, which laid the foundation of the others, deserves particular notice, as affording an instance of the interference of the Legislature in directing the management of lands, and at the same time serving to show how useful all regulations of this kind are found upon trial. It was commended by almost every distinguished statesman during the reigns of the Tudor family; and, from the care taken to revive or improve it by the parliaments for about a century, it should seem as if its utility had been generally acknowledged. Sir Thomas More, in his "Utopia," hints at the usefulness of a law of this kind; and Lord Bacon took every occasion to recommend it in the House of Commons and in his writings. In the year 1597, distinguished for the high price of grain, "Mr. Francis Bacon stood up, and made a motion in the House of Commons against inclosures, and depopulation of towns and houses, of husbandry and tillage. For inclosure of grounds brings depopulation—which brings first, idleness; secondly, decay of tillage; thirdly, subversion of houses, and decay of charity and charges to the poor; fourthly, impoverishing the state of the realm." His

\* 4 H. VII. c. 19.

§ 2 & 3 Ph. and M. c. 2

† 6 H. VIII. c. 5; 7 H. VIII. c. 1;

¶ 5 Eliz. c. 2.

27 H. VIII. c. 22.

|| 39 Eliz. c. 1, 2.

‡ 5 & 6 Ed. VI. c. 5.

speech was seconded by Sir John Fortescue, Chancellor of the Exchequer, who gave his opinion much in the same way with Mr. Bacon.\*

Lord Bacon afterwards, in his "Life of Henry the Seventh," expatiates upon this statute, and tells us, "that it was of singular policy, for the population apparently; and, if it be thoroughly considered, for the soldiery and military forces of the realm."

Inclosures at that time began to be more frequent, whereby arable land, which could not be manured without families, was turned into pasture, which was easily rid by a few herdsmen; and tenancies for years, lives, and at will, whereupon much of the yeomanry lived, were turned into demesnes. This bred a decay of people, and, by consequence, a decay of towns, churches, tithes, and the like. The King, likewise, knew full well, and in no wise forgot, that there ensued withal upon this a decay and diminution of subsidy and taxes; for the more gentlemen—ever lower the book of subsidies. The ordinance was, that all houses of husbandry, that were used with twenty acres of ground and upwards, should be maintained and kept up for ever, together with a competent proportion of land to be used and occupied with them, and in no wise to be severed from them, as by another statute made afterwards in his successor's time was more fully declared. By this means the houses being kept up, did, of necessity, enforce a dweller; and the proportion of land being kept up, did, of necessity, enforce that dweller not to be a beggar or cottager, but a man of some substance, that might keep hinds and servants, and set the plough on going.†

From the time of enacting this statute to the reign of James the First, every scarcity of grain was usually imputed by the commonalty to the neglect of enforcing it; and its revival was always considered as the most effectual means of restoring plenty. And though the landowners had sometimes interest enough in the parliament to have bills of this kind rejected, yet this act was so popular, or thought to be so beneficial or necessary, that they were frequently obliged to submit to its revival.‡ And there is no doubt but it was agreeable to the petty farmers and labourers in husbandry, as it promised to supply them with employment and a maintenance. The greatest part of the landowners considered it in another light, as was evident from the care they took to elude or defeat it; though enforced and improved by succeeding parliaments, it appears to have been thought inconsistent with their interest.§

\* Parl. Hist. vol. iv. p. 414.

† Bacon's "Life of Henry the Seventh," p. 596.

‡ Parl. Hist. vol. iii. p. 247.

§ Landed proprietors found that tillage did not pay so well as stock, wool, butter, cheese, &c.



UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS - URBANA



N30112070012700A